U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

A NATIONAL DIALOGUE: THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION'S COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, APRIL 7, 2006

+ + + + +

The Public Hearing was convened in the Victory Ballroom, 9th Floor of the Hilton Hotel, 120 West Market Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, at 8:12 a.m., Charles Miller, Chairman, presiding.

COMMISSIONER PRESENT:

GERRI ELLIOTT
CHARLES VEST
CHARLES MILLER, Chairman
ARTHUR ROTHKOPF
JONATHAN GRAYER
DAVID WARD
RICK STEPHENS
BOB MENDENHALL
LOUIS SULLIVAN
KATI HAYCOCK
ROBERT ZEMSKY
JAMES HUNT
RICHARD VEDDER
NICHOLAS DONOFRIO
ARTURO MADRID
JIM DUDERSTADT
SARA MARTINE TUCKER

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS PRESENT:

SALLY STROUP
PETER FALETRA
EMILY DeROCCO
JOHN BAILEY
WILLIAM BERRY

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

DAVID DUNN, Chief of Staff
CHERYL OLDHAM, Executive Director
VICKIE SCHRAY
ELEANOR SCHIFF
DAVID DUNN

PRESENTERS:

JAY PFEIFFER	Assistant Deputy Commissioner, Accountability, Research, and Measurement, Florida Department of Education
GASTON CAPERTON	President, College Board
PETER JOYCE	Workforce Development Manager CISCO Systems
RICHARD KAZIS	Senior Vice President, Jobs for the Future
PETER EWELL	Vice President, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems
ROGER BENJAMIN	President, Council for Aid to Education, RAND Corporation
STEPHEN P. KLEIN	Senior Research Scientist, RAND Corporation
PETER McPHERSON	President, National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges
ANNE NEAL	President, American Council of Trustees and Alumni
GEORGE K. KUH	Director, Center for Postsecondary Research, Indiana University
KEVIN CAREY	Research and Policy Manager, Education Sector

A G E N D A

Welcome and Overview of Format
for Public Hearing 4

PRESENTERS

Jay Pfeiffer, Assistant Deputy Commissioner
Florida Department of Education 6

Gaston Caperton, President, College 19
Board

Peter Joyce, Workforce Development 23
Manager CISCO Systems

Richard Kazis, Senior Vice President,. . . .34
Jobs for the Future

Peter Ewell, Vice President, National . . . 77
Center for Higher Education Management
Systems

Roger Benjamin, President, Council for . . .86
Aid to Education, RAND Corporation

Stephen P. Klein, Senior Research 86
Scientist, RAND Corporation

George Kuh, Director, Center for 101
Postsecondary Research, Indiana
University

Peter McPherson, President, National 125
Association of State Universities and
Land-Grant Colleges

Anne Neal, President, American Council . . .138
of Trustees and Alumni

Kevin Carey, Research and Policy 151
Manager, Education Sector

ADJOURN

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(8:12 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Good morning. We've been able to control everything in this discussion except the weather. And the way we scheduled these meetings in the past, we have a full morning of presentations and questions and answers and we've left in some room at the end for discussion.

Today, I'm going to ask the group to try to get as much of the discussion in during the panel's time so that we can finish without losing the last presenter or two because they're very, very important and a big part of our material and our input. And in the process, we're going to let a couple of presenters make their presentation before we do the Q&A, a little differently than we tried yesterday and it will go smoother that way and more effectively and will break down the presentations better that way.

I thought we had a very powerful session yesterday. I want to make some part of it clear. At the end of the day when we had our open discussion, some people characterized that as a vote and we use that term rather loosely. I don't consider that a legal or any kind of other formal vote. And when we do that, we're going to post that in advance. We're

going to put out what the things are that are going to be voted on, if we can in time. We're going to have formal motions if we do that and we're going to have discussions on the motions and do it in that kind of a formal process.

Yesterday, was a very valuable benefit for the Commission to talk and to vent and to comment and it did show some of the values in the sense of where people relate things. By the time we get to the May meeting, we're going to have some of those things refined more and we're going to have some ability to have specific recommendations and things that would be actionable if we do this right. So for people to understand that process.

We have an open agenda in May. We won't have the traditional presentations. We hope to have in front of the Commission, with the Commission's input, what it would be -- what would be recommended or put in a formal report, the final part.

The two major topics today are articulation and accountability and assessment. The Commission's had a wide variety of inputs on the process by which students in the education system move through the structure K through 12, community colleges, specialized institutions and four-year

colleges into the workforce and back into education. The general theme will be covered today by a very interesting panel moderated by Jay Pfeiffer from Florida.

On accountability and assessment, there's been also far-reaching dialogue about accountability and today we will focus on the measurement of institutional performance and assessment of teaching and learning and we will hear from a broad array of participants.

We're in an era of accountability where everything we do is subject to intense scrutiny, and when it involves public purposes of course it should be. Advances in information and communications technology allow us to do more to review and analyze our actions and decisions. We can and must apply these innovations to make significant improvements in the productivity and efficiency and efficacy of our colleagues and institutions. I can write it better than I can say it, thank you.

We have a distinguished panel to address this theme, moderated by Peter Ewell. Please begin.

MR. PFEIFFER: Mr. Chairman, I'm Jay Pfeiffer. I'm with the Florida Department of Education. I want to thank you and the Commissioners

for allowing me to join three great colleagues here to present to you this morning.

I feel compelled here right at the beginning, being that I am in Indianapolis and I am from Florida and I am an alumnus from the University of Florida, to supposedly referred to pass on the basketball game, but I won't.

(Laughter.)

MR. PFEIFFER: I have provided the Commission with two documents that I'm going to referred to. One is a written statement. I will referred to that very briefly. The second is a set of data and I will go over the set of data to kind of set a context for our panel this morning.

It seems that as I listened yesterday and as I read the materials that the Commission has considered, that one of the things that is a crucial piece of the deliberations that you're undertaking, are the data that underpin all of this. The data that are necessary to tell the stories of the flows of students into and out of the education system. My statement's a little bit about those data.

Now in education circles, particularly in education data circles, Florida's education data system is kind of considered the Cadillac of state

systems. We have long had individually identifiable student data for public schools, workforce programs, adult education programs, community college programs and university programs in Tallahassee within the Department of Education.

In addition to having these kinds of resources, we have established a practice with partner agencies of joining these data with other agencies that have data that basically complement, I almost said complicate, they do that too, the education process. We have data relationships, for example, with our state labor agency which allow us to look at employment results of our students as they are in education and as they exit the education system. We worked closely with our workforce programs, vocational rehabilitation. Our children and family services agencies and a variety of agencies like that.

Now in working with those agencies and working within our own department, in days past when we were asked to join these data to look at things longitudinally, to look at the flows of students from K-12 into postsecondary, that's a pretty hard process. These data were all designed in separate boxes, separate governance boxes with different purposes and different data elements and different conventions.

And so every time you pulled this data together you had to kind of consider all of those conventions and come up with the rules to bring them together. It's a hard process.

But, the results are data that show a picture that really is not a very well informed picture. That is, the picture of what happens to students as they flow through K-12 -- as they flow into postsecondary, as they move back and forth into the labor force and out of the labor force. Those pictures piqued the interest of our legislature and our governor and that, in addition to increased pressure to be more accountable in the state of Florida, the legislature authorized the creation of a K-20 education data warehouse.

To build this data warehouse we had to go through all those little difference that I talked about in bringing data together. We had to come up with the rules and the processes to bring it together. And at this point we've finally done that. And we are just now beginning to reap some of the benefits of having student level data in a K-20 repository.

It's getting to be the go to place in Florida for things that people want to know about education.

I've outlined in my statement a number of types of services with some examples of applications of the data warehouse and I'll highlight the types of things that I chronicle, if you will, in that statement.

One is that a lot of what we do feeds consumers. And by consumers I'm referring to students and their parents, for younger students, adult students. I'm also referring to teachers. Providing information to students and teachers to facilitate the decisions that they make sometimes everyday as they do their jobs and as students consider careers. We also have a variety of education and workforce accountability and public reporting mechanisms, reports and other kinds of things that I've referred to. The kinds that I've highlight is what I refer to as feedback reports. We have a very robust high school feedback report where every high school can see what happened to their students after they left the high school. Every community college can see what happened to their students as they left the community college and either went into the upper division in the university system or into the workforces.

I've also highlighted in those comments that having these resources has piqued the interest of

private and independent postsecondary institutions who kind of want to avail themselves of those resources, too. And we've worked with them to integrate some of their processes into what we do.

The final piece that I referred to is policy evaluation and research. The department does research using these data on its own, but we have limited staff resources. So what we've done is increasingly provide anonymized data sets, often aggregated data, sometimes anonymized individual data to researchers and universities and foundations for them to do research with a *quid pro quo* arrangement. They do research that helps us in forming policy, that helps us evaluate the effects of programs that we have. From a data guy prospective, this stuff is extraordinarily cool. Data are very detailed. We have lots of information about the students and about their accomplishments, their progress, their attainment, those kinds of things.

Because we built all these things over time, there's fair demand on our staff to work with other states, to work with the department, to work with foundations and other organizations to assist them in not only understanding what we have but provide guidance about how they might have some of

this kind of stuff, too, technical assistance.

And in that process we've learned a few things. And my recommendations are very high level recommendations but nonetheless result from those experiences.

One recommendation is that -- I heard a lot of talk here yesterday in testimony about institutional interest. Heard a lot of talk about federal interest. There's also a state interest in this. We invest a lot in this system. And so one of the things that I would urge you to do as you consider more robust data requirements is really look at a state role in doing this. If we are talking about accountability in higher education, we all ought to be talking the same language. We don't want the state of Florida to be saying one thing about its institutions and the federal government saying something different, or at least something that has nuances that appear to be different, it confuses the public, it doesn't help inform.

The second piece is really -- it almost gets in the weeds a little bit, it has to do with what's called FERPA. The Family Educational Records Protection Act. Virtually anywhere you go, whether it's at the institution level, whether it's with an

MIS guy buried in a school district or at the state level, FERPA is raised as a barrier to building the kinds of data systems and the kind of relationships that I've referred to. FERPA needs to be administered different, ladies and gentlemen. It needs to be administered in a way where we inform states about practices, about ways that they can build these systems but importantly to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the records that are in our charge.

We have done a lot of that on our own as a state. We need to do it as a nation so that we can build these systems and we can be better informed about what we're doing.

I'm going to shift gears really quick and try to set a context for my colleagues on the panel. I'm going to referred to this set of charts that are in your materials that were given to you this morning.

We, in the last year in Florida, formed a higher education access task force that was comprised largely of leaders of our institutional boards of governors, people like you from the private sector and people like you who represent a variety of interests, focusing on Florida. One of my initial charges was to define the pipeline, come up with ways that the task force could look at the pipeline, the flows of

students and kind of as we initially started describing it, one of the things that becomes real apparent immediately is that there's about as many ways to describe the flows as there are students flowing. We have a system that provides lots of points of access and lots of opportunities to move in and out and around the education systems.

Forgive me, Mr. Chairman, but a colleague of mine used the analogy saying that it's not a pipeline, it's like a climbing wall. You kind of go up this way and then you scurry over and then you go up a little and then maybe down a little and then back over. So it wasn't easy to describe this flow except that we tried to do it in a way that highlighted three issues. And this little set of charts describes those three issues.

The first, the light blue one. One of the things that the task force was concerned about is increasing access to higher education in Florida both in terms of increasing the number of people in higher education but also increasing the proportion of people who participate in higher education. One of the first things we talked about is Florida is a growing state. It's a fast growing state. We get about 1,000 new citizens a week and they're not all old people, a lot

of them are young people, looking for jobs. We have very low unemployment in Florida. So there's pretty good employment opportunities there right now. And what this basically means is that if we do absolutely nothing in Florida with postsecondary education, we're going to have to accommodate more people. We're going to have to accommodate more people coming out of high school. We're going to have to accommodate more people who are the people who are coming out of high school but delay their postsecondary education for a year or two and we're going to have to create room for more people who are adults. And the idea was that any policy that the access task force, the acronym was ATF by the way, that the access task force, anything that they would do that would increase the flow of students would add on to that automatic increase that we would have to accommodate. So that was one thing. Just the fact that we talked about these three population groups informed people. But most people just tend to think of going to high school, coming out of high school and popping them into postsecondary.

The second set of charts, the colorful ones on the second page, deal with two issues. One is persistence and one is postsecondary attainment. The persistence one is a little hard to look at, it's real

colorful. That's one reason it's hard to look at, the other reason is it's pretty complicated. To look at this particular chart we had to go back in time because it looks at longitudinal data. It looks at the class that graduated from Florida public high schools in 1996. You will see that about 50 percent of those students who graduated with standard diplomas, about 90,000 of them back in 1996, started into postsecondary in Florida the year after that graduated. You also see in the second year, that's the yellow piece of this bar, the second year we lost about 10,000 of them that moved out of the postsecondary system. At the same time we picked up 6500 that weren't there the first year. When you go to the third year it starts getting complicated. We lose about 6,000 of the original group. We lost about half of the people that entered in the second year, we picked up some people from the first year who weren't there in the second year and we picked up some people who weren't there in the first or second year. And that you can see that it gets more and more complicated.

Two points. One is the overall participation of this class over time is dropping. The second is, that it's increasingly characterized by

students who are stopping in and stopping out. And one of the troubles that we have with students that are stopping in and stopping out is that they are less likely to complete postsecondary education when they do that, even though the system is really set up to accommodate it.

The second chart, the pie. This asks the question for the same class, what did they attain, what's the highest level of any kind of educational attainment 10 years after they graduated from high school. The startling thing to the task force and to others is that for this class of 1996, 90,000 students, 70,000 of those -- 70 percent, excuse me, of those students 10 years after they graduate, their highest level of attainment is what they got when they left high school. Even though most of them participated in postsecondary, most of them have no postsecondary credentials. That leads us to the labor market, which is the last slide.

Pretty controversial conversation there, pretty difficult conversation because we get into stuff about supply and demand and what does that mean and how do you measure all this stuff. We tried to be pretty basic, we tried to use pretty basic sets of information to describe what the demands are for

levels of postsecondary attainment over time. Most recently -- the usually available data to states are ten year projections. Those ten year projections showed that of the fastest-growing occupations in Florida, most of them require a postsecondary credential but less than a bachelor's degree.

However, when we go out to the 23rd and we engaged in a little effort with the Florida Council of 100 employer organizations with the state legislature and tried to take these projections out to the 23rd, take them out a little longer term. And interestingly we see some shifts. Still a lot of demand for those occupations that require an education less than a bachelor's degree but the proportion of demand made up of people who need a bachelor's degree and higher kinds of credentials is increasing rapidly. So the demands in the labor market in these new occupations is ratcheting up in terms of postsecondary credentials.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to basically move to my colleagues on my left. Interestingly, because of these data resources in Florida, we have arrangements with each of these fellows. We've been able to share information and share resources back and forth, kind of a quid pro quo

for both parties. We are right now negotiating a process with the College Board where we will provided through our data warehouse, data that complements their very robust research on articulation and the importance of the test scores that they administer. And at the same time we will have those resources in our data warehouse.

I'd like to introduce you all to Gaston Caperton.

GOV. CAPERTON: Thank you very much. I was asked to talk about our advanced placement program. The College Board is a national not-for-profit membership organization of more than 5,000 colleges, schools and universities with the challenging mission of preparing and connecting students to college success.

The College Board's most powerful teaching and learning program is its advanced placement program. Its underlying goals are excellent and equity. As a set of 38 college-level courses taught in high school, AP represents the highest standards of academic excellence in our high schools. The three principles and values of the AP program are quite simple and straightforward.

First, AP supports academic excellence.

AP represents a commitment to high standards and enriched academic experience for students and for teachers.

Two, AP is about equity. We believe that every student should have access to AP courses and should be given the opportunity to prepare for these courses.

Three, AP drives school wide academic rigor. Schools that use AP for setting high standards for all students see significant return in the overall quality and intensity of academic programs.

The most important message I could leave with you today is AP is not for the aggrieved. It is for the prepared. Students who are ready to work hard, put in extra time and effort and who have quality teachers leading their AP courses, will succeed in AP and will be well-prepared for college success.

Our data shows there are many more U.S. students who can succeed at AP math and science courses if they're simply given the chance. This year in the U.S. we anticipate more than 100,000 students will earn a grade of three or better in an AP calculus exam. But our research shows that based on performance on the PSAT, at least 600,000 students

could be taking and succeeding in AP calculus. The same gap exists in AP physics, AP chemistry and AP biology. This means that there are literally hundreds of thousands of high school students in the U.S. who are able to succeed in rigorous AP courses that are not enrolled in these courses.

There are three major obstacles preventing students from learning at this higher level.

One, the lack of AP teachers in the school; two, the lack of adequate encouragement and support to take AP courses; and three, the lack of hard work and high expectations.

Both the President and the members of the Senate and House have proposed legislation and funding that would drastically expand AP participation and success in math and science. This is extremely -- we believe this is an extremely important opportunity for our nation. AP math and science students are more likely than other students to major in science and math and engineering disciplines than students whose first exposure to college-level math and science courses are in college.

Our research shows that AP math and science courses prepare American students to achieve at a level of proficiency that exceeds students in all

other nations.

I ask, if I may be a little presumptuous, as you prepare your final report to the Secretary and the President you consider the following recommendations.

Urge Congress to fully fund the President's request to support AP expansion including the training of 70,000 new AP teachers in math, science and world languages over the next five years.

Two, urge all colleges and universities to support AP programs by training more AP teachers;

And prepare students for -- urge all colleges and universities to support AP programs by training more AP teachers; and

Three, urge all high schools to offer four AP courses, prepare students for AP and have an open door policy which allows every student to succeed in AP.

The College Board believes that AP has a tremendous potential to drive reform in a powerful way in our nation's schools. No single program can have as strong an impact on the overall student and teacher quality as AP.

In closing, AP is not for the elite, it is for the prepared. AP is about high expectations and

hard work. Thank you very much.

MR. PFEIFFER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I would comment on Mr. Caperton's presentation by pointing out if you put those charts that I've shown you on persistence and attainment, you will see that students who have participated in advanced placement programs are very highly qualify and in terms of that attainment pie, nearly all of them attained their postsecondary credentials. So used that kind of as a context.

The next presenter is Peter Joyce, the manager of CISCO Systems Workforce Development Program. We have a great project with CISCO in Florida that is basically looking at science, technology, engineering and math disciplines. CISCO is promoting the participation of young women in those disciplines in Florida. We've been able to use research that we worked with the Ed Trust on and research that we've actually worked with the University of South Florida on to support the aims of this project. Peter.

MR. JOYCE: Good morning. In my role at CISCO I'm often invited to speak to school groups and so when I speak to an elementary school group I always start with a big greeting, like I just did, and

usually get back a melodious good morning, Mr. Joyce.

(Laughter.)

MR. JOYCE: When I speak to high school students and I start with that greeting I usually get some sort of grunt. And then finally when I speak to college students or higher education students and I say good morning, everybody writes it down.

(Laughter.)

MR. JOYCE: You won't need to write things down since I have submitted my remarks and they're included in your briefing book. I want to be sure that I thank the Chairman, Mr. Miller, and the Commission, Secretary Spellings and her staff, both those inside and outside the door, you've done a great job and certainly have made me feel welcome. And I also appreciate in part that CISCO has an opportunity to share our perspective as you make recommendations aimed at maintaining the competitive edge of America's higher education system in this dynamic global economy.

Some may ask why a company is represented at this meeting, no less talking about articulation. I guess it's best defended by a revision of the old line, and no offense to the Commission, but it's about the workforce stupid.

The Education Research Institute at UCLA recently reported a 60 percent decline in computer science and undergraduate enrollment between 2000 and 2004. Meanwhile, the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, predicts that IT related jobs will grow 45 to 68 percent between 2000 and 2012.

CISCO Systems believes it has a stake in higher education and wants to support an education system that excites young people about technology. CISCO wants to foster an education system that works in partnership across grades and with employers. To shore up an education system that insures that we have the high skilled people who can support our industry into the future.

During my time today, I will provide you with a brief overview of our company, describe a global education initiative we launched nine years ago, and outline the lessons learned that should be considered as you move forward with your charge.

Some of you know that CISCO was founded in 1984 by a small group of computer scientists from Stanford University. As a result, the company maintains a special place in its heart for higher education and education in general.

In those early years, the multi-protocol

router was known to a few who had a specialized knowledge of the backroom network operations of IT centers. And today, networks are an essential part of business, education, government and home communications, and CISCO Internet protocol, or IP based networking solutions, are in the foundation of these networks. CISCO hardware, software, and service offerings are used to create Internet solutions that allow individuals, companies, and countries to increase productivity, improve customer satisfaction, and strengthen competitive advantage.

At CISCO our vision is to change the way people work, live, play and learn. If there's one message, a take away message I'd like to offer today, it's the fact that contrary to popular opinion, the IT industry is alive and well. It took 38 years for the radio to reach 50 million users. But in just four years, the Internet had that same number of users.

CISCO's tradition of IT innovation continues with industry-leading products in the core areas of routing and switching, as well as advanced technologies. Today we have Canadian surgeons who are performing medical procedures on patients 2,000 miles away using robotics and a spider network that maintain a constant connection. Buses in New York City are

using CISCO mobile routers to send real-time information from a network engine to indicate mechanical problems, thereby eliminating any unexpected difficulties or delays.

Even the adoption of IP telephones have extended beyond large corporate customers and have moved into the homes through our Linksys brand. With more than 34,000 employees worldwide, CISCO remains committed to creating networks that are smarter, faster and more durable.

As the Internet made its way into our everyday lives, schools across all levels turned to CISCO for assistance in designing and building networks. Despite very good intentions, it became clear that schools needed to build the internal capacity to support these networks. So CISCO, aimed at providing a solution to this challenge, launched the CISCO networking academy program, a comprehensive e-learning program that provides students with Internet technology skills. The networking academy delivers web based content, uses on-line assessment, student performance tracking, hands on labs, instructor training and support, and preparation for industry standard certifications.

Launched in October of 1997 with 64

education institutions in seven states, the networking academy program has now spread to more than 150 countries. Since its inception, more than 1.6 million students have enrolled at more than 10,000 academies, a bit more than our 64 that we started with I would say.

Academies are located in high schools, technical schools, colleges, universities, and community-based organizations. I like to say wherever you have an Internet connection and motivated students, you can have an academy.

In the U.S., we have about 4,000 academies. About 45 percent of those are at the secondary level, about 45 percent are in higher education, community colleges, as well as four-year colleges. And then about 10 percent are in homeless shelters, job core centers and other non-traditional settings.

Initially our fundamentals of networking course was created to prepare students for the associate level certification, CCNA. Given the high demand, we next launched the advanced networking course, which is aligned with the network professional level certification, CCNP. All this is alphabet soup, I'm sure. We also handed courses in wireless and

security. Eventually, we expanded our program at the entry-level to include courses on the basics of hardware and software which are aligned to CompTIA's A+ certification and a course on infrastructure essentials. And this is sponsored by Panduit, one of our business partners, and the course is aligned with their new certification.

When the academy program was first designed, we created a three-tiered system to grow and support participating schools. I like to refer to it as the Amway pyramid. Education institutions are given designations based on the level of training that they'll be providing in the program. So industry experts at CISCO train the instructor trainers at the CISCO Academy training centers, who are at the top of the pyramid, and the training center instructors train regional academy instructors, regional academy instructors train local academy instructors, who then educate students. Also, any of those levels can also be educating students at the same time.

Using this three tiered model helps provide instructors the training they need in close proximity to where they are located. Education institutions may play a role at one or more of these trainings levels, as I just noted.

It's often said that elementary schools don't talk to high schools, high schools don't talk to colleges and colleges only talk to God. The impact of the CISCO networking academy field structure has fostered the development of deep and unique relationships between education institutions. The standardized curriculum has led to an effective articulation models between high schools and colleges whereby students are able to accelerate the progression of their learning. Many of our partner colleges have either worked with CISCO volunteer engineers to host cooperative activities that engage students in their learning and serve as a vehicle to provide information for educating students about career pathways and to the information technology industry.

The Internet has the power to change the way people learn and the CISCO academy program is in the forefront of this transformation.

Having described our expertise in technology and how this knowledge led to an extraordinary initiative with learning institutions around the globe, let me share for general lessons from our experience.

Lesson one. Unprecedented partnerships

are the ultimate goal. Our business model is based upon a concept which we refer to as our ecosystem. It's a network of partnerships with companies that serve as our channel for product and service. We depend on these partners for 95 percent of our revenue. They allow us to reach into markets we could never take advantage of alone. When the academy program was launched, we never imagined that we would be fostering the development of unprecedented partnerships between high schools, community colleges, four-year colleges, as well as community-based organizations. Our tiered model opened the door for many new relationships. Many of our training centers and regional academies reach out to their school partners to provide technical support. This is a people to people relationship where partners share pedagogical practices, equipment and technology innovations. These relationships have also fortified new or existing articulation agreements. The partners co-run recruitment efforts, they often worked with CISCO and our business partners to host joint events such as a career fairs and even technical competitions which helps students see the direct connection between institutions and the workplace.

These relationships go beyond the paper

thin articulation agreements that are often alluded to when referring to partnerships.

Lesson number two. The programs industry standardized curriculum provides a lot of value. Our course content is standardized and the assessments are taken online, which offer a direct bridge across secondary and postsecondary, as well as between community colleges and four-year colleges. More importantly, this shared curriculum creates a system with various entry and exit points, offering accommodations and flexibilities for incumbent workers and dislocated workers.

As we added courses, both introductory and advanced, we continue to build a pipeline along career pathways.

Lesson three. Certifications establish credibility and accountability. Each of our courses is aligned with industry certification. These portable certifications are designed to maintain quality within our industry. However, in a multi-level education system, these certifications also validate a student's knowledge and skill set. Students can move from course to course, from institution to institution, efficiently progressing without duplication.

Lesson four. Clear pathways help encourage postsecondary education. Nine years ago, there were many students who would finish their CCNA certifications in high school and attain jobs in the industry. As the industry has matured, the skill requirements have been raised, and today, most jobs require some level of postsecondary education. It has become more important than ever that institutions ensure that students understand the sequence of learning necessary for careers in our industry. The best way to do this is to formalize the connections between courses and institutions through articulation, dual enrollment, and credit granting across continuing ed and degree programs.

When I began my presentation, I asked why a company like CISCO would be speaking at this meeting. I said then that we had an important stake in education and an investment in our industry's future workforce. The future is hard to predict, even for a technology company. We often refer to working in the dog years around CISCO. The technology, and therefore, the respective skills, are changing rapidly. But one thing is certain in this rapidly changing dynamic global economy, partnerships between industry and across education institutions,

particularly in higher education, will be a critical success factor.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

MR. PFEIFFER: Thank you, Peter. Mr. Chairman, commissioners the next presenter is Richard Kazis, who is a senior vice president with Jobs for the Future. I mentioned in my presentation that we have worked with organizations to kind of present our Florida data model, if you will, and provide communication with other states about how they might do it. Jobs for the Future has been a great asset in helping us do that. Richard?

MR. KAZIS: Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to have this opportunity to speak with you today. I want to congratulate the Commission on two things from yesterday. One is I thought that the process at the end of the day with the stickies and the non vote vote I thought was very encouraging in terms of the priorities -- the three top priorities that came up, access and success for all students, expansion of financial aid, and lifelong learning. That was encouraging.

Second, I want to congratulate you for what my father used to call is its flesh, which means

sitting flesh.

So the topic this morning is articulation, how the pieces of the education system have not been together, the challenges that this poses for higher education and how the situation can be improved. Broadly, it's about the alignment and expectations, standards, courses, programs across different education levels and sectors. It's critically important obviously in terms of improving college readiness. It's critically important also in a world where mobility, time constraints, geographic considerations and student choice are making it far more common for the college experience to involve multiple courses taken at multiple institutions over many years.

Today I want to share with you lessons that we are learning in my organization, Jobs For the Future, from two ambitious foundations funded initiatives that bear on strategies to improve articulation and alignment. These are the early college high school initiative, funded by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation; and the Achieving the Dream initiative, led by the Lumina Foundation for Education here in Indianapolis.

Now, I will say my remarks are somewhat

from the ground up, but I hope that they lead to some useful perspective and recommendations for the commission's consideration. The early college -- you have this in your testimony, but just quickly though, the early college, high school initiative has already created over 80 small new schools that combine secondary and post secondary learning in the same institution, resulting in both a high school diploma and an associate's degree or significant credits towards an AA degree. The plan is for about 200 new schools by 2011. They are being created by dozens of organizations. Some are state groups like the new schools project in North Carolina, some are national groups like the National Council of La Raza and the Woodrow Wilson foundation. Our organization, Jobs For the Future, is the lead organization coordinating the efforts to build new schools. The second initiative I'm going to talk about and draw lessons from is Achieving the Dream. That's a post secondary education reform initiative involving 35 colleges, community colleges, and seven states, Connecticut, Florida, North Carolina, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas and Virginia. Their focus is on using the analysis of outcome data -- student outcome data to develop institution wide reform strategies to improve student

success, particularly for first generation, low income, minority students. And in this initiative how overall, jobs of the future, is to focus on the policies and support for the institutional change. Each initiative leads to a different said policy issues and concerns.

A couple of words before I jump into that. If we think of articulation as a "process which enables students to make a smooth transition without delay, duplication of courses or loss of semester credits," which is something I got off of one college's web site last week when I was trying to figure out what people really mean when you say this. If you think of articulation in that way, there are plenty of articulation disconnects that the Commission needs to think about and address and that posed obstacles to post secondary success. Peter hinted at one, which is the articulation of industry certificates in college courses and programs.

There are challenges in, also not talked about in the day or so, between articulation between more traditional institutions and the for-profit set of higher education. Articulation across multiple institutions in the same state and across states. And of course, the ones that I'm going to focus on and

that you have focused on to some extent already, the alignment of K-12 and postsecondary learning and the alignment and articulation between two and four-year institutions. The costs, obviously, in terms of proficiency, retention, completion are very high. And it's a particular challenge, all of these mis-alignments and mis-articulations, in terms of a group that we haven't spoken of that much in the past day and a half, which is adult learners. And we haven't spoken about explicitly adult learners for whom setbacks in the accumulation of credit for an ease of access to learning is an extremely high barrier to persistence and success.

The poor alignment between K-12 and postsecondary institutions is familiar ground to the Commission. Mike Cohen from Achieve, David Conley of the University of Oregon have testified before you, and Kati Haycock focused like a laser on these issues. But the impact of unpreparedness and underpreparedness for college work is critically important to meeting the goal that the Commission has put at the top of your list there yesterday afternoon.

Being academically unprepared to succeed in higher education is among, of course as you know, the strongest predictors of failure in college. More

powerful than socio-economic status, race or gender. Huge numbers of unqualified or minimally qualified students from all economic backgrounds enroll in college but the majority of these never earn a degree. Not surprisingly, lower income students are especially likely to be unqualified, academically unqualified for college and not to complete.

So the two initiatives I'm talking about today, early college high schools and Achieving the Dream and lessons I'm drawing from them, point I guess to two themes that I'd like the Commission to think about and some recommendations on doing something related to these issues of preparation and alignment.

First is the theme that there is a real power to the college experience in high school. And not just for those who start high school likely to do well. And I'll get to some points about that in a minute that come out of some of the work that we've been involved in. And the second is that improvement in college success, particularly for students in community colleges, requires far more attention to the alignment of data systems across educational and employment sectors and increased state and institutional capacity to use data well for the improvement purposes rather than just for compliance

purposes. And this is something that Jay is the expert on.

So, first, on the power of college in high school. You have had testimony and there's certainly a lot -- there's almost like I guess a growing kind of consensus around a certain number of reforms like aligning high school exit tests, graduation requirements, college placement tests and improving the signals that high school students and teachers get about what it takes to succeed in college. So the alignment of the tests and the signals.

Second, set a rigorous core curriculum as a default. It's probably something that you've been talking about.

Third, greater transparency about the expectations and quicker intervention to help those who are struggling while in high school, through giving a college placement exam to students while they are in high school and to start crafting an intervention that can actually help those who are behind get ready for college by the time they leave high school.

And to do this requires higher education leaders and front line experts in higher ed teaching and learning to get involved in both the alignment

process but also in the intervention.

Our organization agrees with these suggestions, but I want to go one step further, if I may. And that is to talk specifically about the power of college and high school. This includes advanced placement, obviously, a subject that Governor Caperton, you know, just spoke to you about. It includes a range of programs often called postsecondary enrollment options or dual enrollment, and includes schools where the integration of college learning and secondary learning is a basic component of school design.

Clearly the public likes this idea. They are rushing for AP course, they're rushing for dual enrollment. Forty states have dual enrollment legislation. The potential, I guess, that people see in possibly shortening their route to college, more academic rigor, more interesting courses, more cost savings, a leg up on college. Parents like it, kids like it. And it's a train that is moving in a lot of different directions.

Most of the beneficiaries of these efforts are already the college bound. They're the kids who are doing well. They're the B students and above. And there's a risk, and I'm glad to have heard

Governor Caperton's comments, but there's the risk, right, that these kinds of efforts bringing college into high school will actually exacerbate inequities rather than accelerate opportunity for all.

But we in our work, and my testimony kind of goes through a number of different programmatic innovations that seem to hold some promise for helping those who start out in high school behind academically, to accelerate their learning and to take college courses while in high school as part of a comprehensive strategy and program of getting them college ready.

I talk about, in the testimony, and I'm going to skip the details for time's sake, the College Now Program in New York City involving 200 high schools and 17 CUNY campuses, two-year and four-year campuses, talk about the beginnings of some evidence from the early college high schools that we are working with, and the Gates Foundation has funded, including the first cohort LaGuardia Middle College in New York, where 75 percent of the students in the first cohort are on track to get their high school diploma and an associate's degree by this summer, five years after they started high school. And these are a cross section of New York City public school kids,

many low income -- well, the majority low income and minority.

And also mentioned in there, the University Park Campus School in Worcester, which I think, Kati, you've been to. Which is an incredible partnership between the Clark University and the Worcester public schools. And an amazing school that has scored at the top of urban schools in Massachusetts on MCAS performance, on kids going to college in their first three graduating classes. So you can get the details there.

But why am I telling you all this? Because people say, well, pilots, you know, we don't care about pilots. Single schools are great, pilots are easy and we're not about -- high school we're about fault, so why are you telling me this.

I think there are two things that I want to emphasize. One is that the key to the success of these programs and schools is that the kind of personal -- the alignment comes alive. Because alignment is coming alive in the personal, regular interaction across secondary and postsecondary sectors. The expectations, the signals, the transparency is not just the policy framework, but it's in the day-to-day running of these programs in

schools. It's in the day-to-day discussions about teaching and learning and about quality and about performance.

And the second reason, which is a little more squishy is these schools -- these college and school models are sowing the seeds of something important. The outlines of which I don't think are yet clear. They blur the boundary between secondary and postsecondary learning, they make higher education a routine expectation and end point, they raise all kinds of questions about the financing of higher education, assumptions about what college learning is, assumptions about what's the default expectation we should have of minimum expectations of education.

I mean there's something going on here that has bigger implications than the individual schools and their results for kids.

So I want to just -- okay, I want to propose, quickly, a few things that the -- areas for the Commission to consider, some recommendations around these kinds of strategies to bring college and high school -- or college into high school. And they include -- the truth is that most of our work is at the state level because that's where most of the rubber hits the road in this kind of work, and so a

lot of these recommendations are actually probably more state recommendations and it might be interesting to think about how you turn -- how does the federal government encourage these kinds of opportunities.

But one, I think, important thing would be to reward and encourage dual enrollment programs that make college and high school not just a course by course option and not just something for those kids who are already on the road to success, but that are part of a comprehensive, high quality college readiness strategy.

Second, the possibility of creating incentives for colleges and universities, particularly those with education schools, to create new high schools like University Park to locate high schools on their campuses, to promote collaboration and deliberation about college readiness skills and expectations.

I think as the federal government has, in a creative way, looked at strategies to promote a core curriculum in high school, one idea might be to consider specifying that a core curriculum in high school include some amount of college course work while in high school.

So that's a couple of ideas. Let me --

I'm running a little late here. Let me quickly go to a second set of points and I'll make these quickly because Jay actually, in his remarks, made a lot of them and Jay exemplifies them.

But the second initiative that I wanted to talk about is the Achieving the Dream Initiative, as I said you have some materials. There are 35 colleges in seven states pursuing data driven institutional change, strategies with support from state teams on how do you move this from pilots to more systematic state led or institution -- state supported institutional change strategies.

These colleges have all started -- have made a comment to saying we're going to use data about student outcomes to figure out how we can improve the progress of our students through the institution and how we can improve student success. Well, the first thing they realized was they don't have a lot of data that helps them figure out how to do that.

The head of the community college association in New Mexico has said I look at the IPEDS data, the student right to know data, first-time, full-time, and find that 90 percent of the students in my community colleges are not in that data base. So anything I'm learning from them, I'm not learning

about the part-timers, I'm not learning about most of the adult students, I'm not learning about the core of my business.

Okay, so Achieving the Dream, colleges and the state systems in which they operate, have found that they can't -- they don't have enough information about students coming in, about what's happening to students when they're there and about where they're going. Where they're going in the work force, where they're going when they transfer.

The two particular areas of weakness, one is developmental education and information about students coming in from adult basic ed or from ELL and then going into and through developmental ed, and the second is information about transfer students once they leave the two-year college, what kind of information can they get from the four-year schools back about the performance of those students so that they could actually improve what they're doing and aligned better.

So this raises, I guess, four recommendations or areas of recommendations that I'd like to leave you with.

One, is the need to strengthen longitudinal student data systems that connect K-12,

two and four-year higher education, the UI employment system and the non-credit postsecondary learning systems like adult ed and workforce programs, much like Florida has been able to build over the past 20 years.

That would lead you to the question, right, of should this be a national student record data system or leave it to the states right now. I know what Jay would say, and he will say. Jay will say leave it to the states. And I would say leave it to the states -- well, I would say actually, probably at some point there should be a national unit record data system but only if the states are involved in its design, only if the states actually get the information coming back down, rather than it all going up. Only if it strengthens the states and the institution's ability to improve and use data for decision making, rather than use it for the kinds of analyses that are further removed from practice. So that's one point.

Second point, I think there's a need to encourage additional indicators of student progress, particularly for underprepared students, so that we're not acting as if -- so that IPEDS information is not the only way to know what's going on in these

institutions and to kind of make public what's going on. So that the story is more robust and more nuanced. And states in Achieving the Dream are actually exploring developing some supplemental indicators from developmental ed through into a semester of college and trying to test that across seven different states.

Third issue that Jay mentioned was the issue of privacy and how the FERPA and privacy rules can be clarified by the federal government, how they can clarify, hopefully in ways that promote rather than restrict access to information and data for research purposes, for decision making and improvement purposes, particularly around the transfer students into four-year institutions.

And finally, I think it's one thing to build all these data systems, it's another thing to create systems that people know how to use and where there's capacity at the institution level and at the state level for using information for decision making. And some strategies around how to strengthen research capacity in a data driven world I think would be worth considering.

That you very much for this opportunity to speak with you.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. Jay, we're scheduled to go on about another 30 minutes with this panel. I know, Governor Caperton, are you okay to stay through this just for that period of time?

GOV. CAPERTON: No problem.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Good. Why don't you interface with the Commission and get questions and answers.

MR. PFEIFFER: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: I should say that this is a fantastic topic for this Commission, for the following reason.

Imagine the higher ed system as a one huge organization. Articulation is the degree to which we can bring efficiency to that system. And I get this from all sides. Melinda Gates is on our Board and Gerald Levy, the former Chancellor, started the schools that Richard referenced. Associate programs in high school is a wonderful way to build confidence in students who are not yet considering going to college. But I ask anyone on the panel to offer advice to the following question. How do we link the issues of articulation to the issues of affordability?

That is, in fact, if we can make the system between different levels of our higher ed

system and between large employers, employers in general, and our system, in essence we will be bringing down the cost of higher education if programs are efficiently transferred through the system. And this became a huge issue in the higher ed reauthorization between for-profits and not-for-profits. But that link is hard to make for people. Because it goes right at the proprietary nature of our system. And I'd be interested in any insights into how you think we can frame that issue well for the public concern with our remarks on this.

MR. PFEIFFER: Panel?

MR. JOYCE: I would just say something about cost and I think that the -- one of the issues is about motivation I think. And particularly when we start talking about different populations. And I think articulation, when you can show that the career pathways are really transparent and folks know what the pathway is, I think that provides motivation. And motivation will bring self-initiative to pursue postsecondary and continue.

And I think some of the numbers that Richard point to and Jay on retention in the system, are kind of disturbing. I mean I think that those are the people we need to not only provide access, but we

need to make sure that students stay in the program.

In our program, we've, for that same issue, and we tried to bring sort of the application of technology to kind of make it come alive, as opposed to the dry stuff in the classroom. That, I think, is aspiration to young people and that will help with cost. I'm not saying cost isn't important, but I think motivation is certainly a key first step to dealing with the issue of cost.

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: In the end, someone takes a program at an institution, spends their time and money, I spoke with a woman last night who is having this experience herself, and that those credits are not easily transferred to the next institution they go to or they have difficulty finding an efficient use for those credits, we as a system have spent more money than we otherwise would have needed to.

Now, that's, you know, a cherry picked example, but it's a massive waste in our system today. And that's really what I'm trying to get at right now.

MR. KAZIS: Two different thoughts. One is on the -- your point is primarily about adult learners and the patterns of, you know, course taking, a little here, a little there, or a program here in a

for-profit and then I want to then go on and learn something else. What do I do with it. So I mean there's a lot of issues in that -- I think it's really critically important because of the nature of how course taking is changing, has changed. So I think you're on to --

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Does that effect the cost? I think that was the question. He's trying to get to the affordability thing.

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: I'm a broken record on affordability as defined by how much it costs.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Cost or affordability is the question.

MR. KAZIS: Well, it's easy to identify the problem, yes, of course it effects the cost in that if I'm taking a course here and I can't use it any more, that's a huge waste. You're absolutely right. I don't know -- how do you grab onto what you're doing --

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: Well, that was my question to.

MR. KAZIS: I know. I know.

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: Okay.

MR. KAZIS: Can I just make one other point that's more about the K-12 to postsecondary

piece of that?

A lot of parents who are looking for -- and kids who are taking college courses in high school, are thinking that there's a cost benefit to them. I'm not sure whether there is. They might make it through college in three years. I don't think so. I think they'll just go to the next level in the way that many kids use AP. They don't cut the fourth year, they use it for more opportunity.

But I think that from a societal viewpoint and you think about cost and affordability and value per -- you know, as cost per degree, the retention issues that Peter talked about.

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: One final point. If we were to be so bold, this Commission could say college is now a three year experience and the year that you're not having in college is going to be had in high school, it's going to transfer into the next institution. You would bring the cost of higher education down. That might not be a good thing, but that is addressing the issue and it is tied up in articulation as defined by the -- and that's a bold statement that I'm not necessarily making but is an example of what I'm trying to get at. You go to Oxford for three years after spending, you know...

MR. PFEIFFER: Similarly what we had in Florida, one of the things that they struggled with was performance measures that deal with graduation from a four-year institution --

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: Right.

MR. PFEIFFER: And graduation from community colleges is continuing to decline.

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: And I just would -- I think some of the Commissioners would be amazed at how well high schools are teaching the first year of college in their high school building where they have controls and where young adults as they move on are not as easily -- it's really a wonderful development that's happening, it's just not well known yet.

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: May I?

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Yes, Dr. Vedder.

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: On this point, which I agree with a hundred percent. Charlie Reed of the California State System made a comment that the 12th year is a vast wasteland or something to that effect, the senior year in high school. Which kind of relates to this whole high school/college interface.

If, in fact, high school/college integration is a key to improving access to lowering attrition, to lowering costs simultaneously, why

aren't we doing more of it? The only question I have is research oriented. What does the statistic say about outcomes? Are outcomes of people that go through these programs materially better, worse, the same, than those who don't? So it's an empirical question to me. If, in fact, the results are positive, as you seem to be hinting based on limited research, I would think that this would be an area, picking up on Jonathan, where we should absolutely be pushing very strongly.

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: But, Richard, you're going to have to have territory. Why wouldn't the answer be that you go to high school, they've got to wake up and you're either not going to quit high school to get the job.

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Are you against the idea?

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: You just don't pay enough attention here to and that one thing but that -- is there --

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Hey, Bob, I thought you used to agree with me all the time. We're in a bad trend here.

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Let me go back to the panel because the other thing that -- two quick

things. One is I appreciate you used the word alignment. I would like us not to use the word articulate. Articulate is a bad verb, align is a good verb. Align tells you what you've got to do. Articulate says what the hell are you talking about. So I am really appreciative that you used the word align.

But the question I have is, even yesterday when we talked about under-represented populations, adults and the like. But almost an urban comment about it. What do any of you know about, in this alignment issue, about where we are on kids, the 27 percent or so, that are still in what might be called rural areas of this country? Do you guys do your work in rural communities

MR. KAZIS: No, we mostly do not.

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Jay, you have a lot of still rural areas in Florida, what's it look like in Florida?

MR. PFEIFFER: Basically, one of the aspects that we have in Florida is a community college system that said early on that no individual in Florida would be further than 50 miles from a campus. And they've largely accomplished that.

The difficulty that I guess we see from a

data perspective is that up in the panhandle where I live where there are still very big rural areas, people do go to community college but it stops there. It does look a little different. So I think that you're correct, there is a

GOV. CAPERTON: You know, I lived in a rural state most of my life. And I've lived in New York for the last eight years, so I've seen a little bit of both. And I think the thing you've got to remember, and we really have to put an emphasis on this, it's about good leadership in a school, it's about good teachers in a school, it's about high expectations for the students in those schools, and it's about a lot of hard work.

You've got to get back down to the fundamentals of what it's all about. It's not about the kids where they come from, it's not about their parents, it's about what kind of opportunity you give them once they get in that school. And too many Americans, particularly poor Americans, don't get that in urban areas or in large cities or small cities. It's about are we going to really be serious about improving our schools. And that's about teaching and learning.

And standards and assessment are a bread

sandwich if you don't get teaching and learning in the middle of it. That's what we've got to really focus on in my opinion.

MR. PFEIFFER: The little slides that I showed you, the colorful bar chart and the pie chart, increasingly I'm being asked to present those.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: I actually have two questions, one for Jay and one for Peter. Jay you have a major system in Florida from a data perspective. I wanted you to give an example of the impact of the data, something that you did different in Florida because you had access to that information.

And then for Peter, you gave information in your testimony about the AP courses for African-Americans and Latino Americans. But I didn't see anything in there about women, females. And I wondered if you had any information on that from an AP standpoint.

MR. JOYCE: I'm about workforce, not AP. If your question is about AP, he can probably catch that.

MR. PFEIFFER: The impact that comes to mind are impacts that deal with the policies that effect the flows of students primarily through K-12. And the example that I would give is the inauguration

a few years ago of a new retention policy for third grade, where students who did not score particularly well in reading in the third grade were not to be promoted.

And data informed that decision, data are basically used now to continuously evaluate the impact of that decision and also to create alternatives other than the state assessment that allow people under certain circumstances to be promoted.

That was a controversial subject and it would just actually -- we just provided data to the state legislature to help inform them about some bills that they're working on.

GOV. CAPERTON: As it relates to the minority population, if you look at the statistics we have in Florida, actually I think you'd be pretty encouraged by it. We start at a very low base but the percentage growth is the greatest growth that we have.

And I'd like to send to the Commission, if this gentleman would allow me, the information that would give you more detail on that.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Okay, thank you.

GOV. CAPERTON: The second question you asked is about women. The real problem we have in our schools today is about men that are not getting

prepared to go to college --

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I really appreciate that.

GOV. CAPERTON: That is the great problem. No, it's a very big problem, let's don't laugh about that. That's a very critical part of American society that we are not addressing as a huge problem. And we used to think it was about minority populations but it's also about white population today. It's a huge problem.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: If you have the data, we would appreciate that.

GOV. CAPERTON: I will give you that data.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Kati. Kati Haycock.

COMMISSIONER HAYCOCK: I want to address a bit of Rich's question about the data and try to gather some of what was said in this panel and what Carol Twigg actually talked about yesterday.

When you sort of step back from this trend that these gentlemen have talked about, that is, you look sort of over the last 20 years and you ask sort of what's been the major change in the high school curriculum, the fact of the matter is the thing that's changed most, I mean the fastest growing part of the

high school curriculum has actually been AP, dual enrollment in other college level courses.

Meanwhile, the fastest growing part of the college curriculum has actually been remedial or developmental or high school level courses.

So my evil twin occasionally says, wait a second, does it make sense for each of us to be reaching over and doing each other's business? What's the impact like on the kids. Until you start looking at the data.

And my evil twin has learned from the data that what is in the end is important, and you've heard it in what Jay said as well as what Gaston and Rich said, what turns out to be important in expanding both access and success is momentum. And the most recent study from the Department of Ed looked at sort of what's the most likely circumstances to get students through to a bachelor's degree is completing 6 to 12 college credits while still in high school. That creates some momentum that turns out to be very powerful in getting students not just in the door but out with a degree.

And again, you've heard the same thing in what Carol said yesterday, is when students get slowed down by failing or simply withdrawing with credit from

those introductory courses, that slows their momentum and ends up vastly increasing the likelihood that they will never get a certificate or a degree.

So as we sort of think about where we're headed as a group, remembering the importance of creating early momentum and keeping it going turns out to be something we really need to think about, and that is the kind of scene as we get to the recommendation phase, will be important for us to think about.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Dr. Vest? Thank you, Kati.

COMMISSIONER VEST: I was in Europe last week and was reading some of the press there about the immigration events in the United States. And they quoted -- and I wish I could remember who it was, they quoted a European diplomat talking about the experience with immigration in his country. And he made the following statement. We opened the gates to admit the workforce and human beings showed up. And I can't get that out of my mind and I want to thank Governor Caperton for reminding us that we can look at all the numbers and so forth we want, but at the heart, this is about human beings.

Having said that, Jay, I first want to

thank you. That was really a very compelling discussion showing why it is so important for us to be able to track individuals through assistance, and also to thank you for pointing out properly, in my view, that FERPA need not be a barrier to learning the things that we need to learn about logistics.

My question, Jay, and I realize I'm sort of reasking the same thing that several people have been dealing with, you made the statement that dropping in and dropping out demonstratively leads to the lower likelihood of graduation.

Now, every time you learn something by asking questions, you raise more questions. How much do you know about why that is. You talked about the ability that maybe that some of these kids literally want to take a course here, a course there. What do we really know?

MR. PFEIFFER: Not much. From our surveys that are done nationally that indicate that kids drop out for financial reasons. I think that there's three or four items that rank up very high that have to do with job opportunities, family obligations and things like that.

I do see -- what we do try to look at to stop out, if you will, is what happened. We try to

look at things like whether or not they get a job, whether they become employed, whether they stay in the state, whether they become dependent on other services.

By and large what we see was through the stop out is that they work. That shouldn't be a surprise because most of them are working while they're in postsecondary. About 60 percent of the students who are in postsecondary are working at the same time.

There is almost like an economic kind of cycle sometimes. People in Florida, as you know for the last two years, have been kind of hammered by some hurricanes. Not like Louisiana and Mississippi this past year, but we've had some disruptions. Those disruptions though have really done some interesting things in our labor forces. There's been some fairly high paying opportunities for people to work on the cleanups and the repairs. And as a result, postsecondary enrollment, especially in community colleges, immediately dropped. There's job opportunities there where people can make money. So I think there's a correlation there that has to do with supporting oneself while they pursue postsecondary education. So I think that there is kind of a dollar

-- those would be the main ones, at least that I observed.

COMMISSIONER VEST: Well, I just think it's really important that somehow we continue to pursue this because in order to draw what the policy is, what is it that you get from this information that helps you improve our size and improve our system. We need to understand that --

MR. PFEIFFER: The whole issue of the hurricanes has been one of interest that I think as a country we can learn about. By having the kind of data sets and employment kinds of things. We haven't done enough and I don't think we're doing enough to really look at how these have impacted people not only in postsecondary but secondary as well and how that also then correlates with the things that have happened.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Governor Hunt?

GOV. CAPERTON: Could I speak to that just a moment, please? Mr. Chairman, could I speak --

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Sure, please.

GOV. CAPERTON: We have at the college board created what we call inspiration awards which we give to three schools every year, that are schools where most of the students come from very low income

families. And when you look at most of these schools, and we've been doing this for four years now, those students will achieve extremely well. The best kids will go to the best schools in the country, the next will go sort of down to the last -- maybe the last 20 percent who won't go to college will end up going into the Army or some place so they get a post education, post high school education.

Now, those students learn in those school environments, they -- those schools we almost can tell you what the formula is. They have a good leader, they have very high expectations for the kids, they all work very hard, and they leave there with those same kind of values and those same kind of beliefs that they can work hard and they can be successful in school.

So I think it really gets back to some pretty fundamental things that makes schools really work. And I don't mean to over-emphasize that. But you have good data in those schools, which is important. You've got to measure. But you really have to have the fundamentals of leadership and good teaching to really create an environment where a kid leaves that school with a commitment and an understanding that they can succeed and they have to

work hard.

And so I think that you can make this thing real fancy and you can go around it all, because it's a lot easier to do a lot of these things that really get down to the hard part, and that is, getting really great teachers in the schools, getting great leadership in the schools and really having a belief that kids can all do well.

That's hard work. That's what's really tough about this thing.

COMMISSIONER HUNT: Mr. Chairman, I want to commend all of our presenters for very good statements. And I've had a chance to work with most of your kinds of efforts.

But I want to say I spent yesterday, and I'm sorry I wasn't here, but with our state legislators in North Carolina and our K-12 and community college and university folks. And just out of those discussions I heard the president of the community college system say that now, I think he said 70 percent of our students are women. And our university -- our state university's 15 campuses, 60 percent of the students are women.

We really have a boys problem or male problem. It's a huge problem. It's not our job to

tend to that, it's all of our job. You think of all the -- if we had the same -- let's say same number of boys, males, going on as we do girls going on, think how much better off America would be.

And, Mr. Chairman, I hope that as we think about all this, you know I come from a state perspective as a lot of us do around here, but I hope we're going to continue to think about how do we advance America. How do we help this nation do better.

Here on an articulation or alignment panel, that's one of the things we're looking at. And I would say to you, if we're going to -- as we think about articulation, what is it about? It is to ease and to help transition, transfer, moving on.

Now, we have to know how we're doing in that. And so the information that you all are getting in Florida, Jay, really is interesting to me. I didn't know you were doing it. I gather that you may be doing it best. And what I want to urge, Mr. Chairman, is that as a nation we do it well. And we find out ways we can help states to do it. And the federal government, our national government, our American government, can do that.

So I want us to look for way that we can

help. I want us to make recommendations about how we can help. And some of them are going to cost money, of course. But it's to do better.

Jay, how did you get that started? I mean let's assume we do it at the state level. I'm going to go back to North Carolina and push harder on it. But that's like complicated. Did the legislature mandate it? Did you get all the systems together and agree on it? How did it happen in Florida?

MR. PFEIFFER: It started in Florida about 20 years ago, Governor. And it was the legislature. And one of the situations you have in a fast growing state is the population of students at all levels grows. And if you don't have an appropriation process that'll respond to that growth, you're going to lose each year, you're going to lose ground each year.

And so the legislature began about 20 years ago to work toward processes where we would monitor on a regular basis the number of students coming in. And to do that we needed state data systems that would enable it.

Part of what we did in trying to implement these systems, I used quid pro quo a minute ago as kind of way of doing business for me. If we're going to have school districts, community colleges and

universities to report data to the state, they ought to get something out of it. And so among the things that we tried to look at would be ways that we could build data systems founded on what they already collected locally, not inventing something new, but that would provide them with services. The initial services that they were mostly interested in was easing some of the things that the legislature required them to do. So if we could do that and we could reduce the level of constantly coming back to an institution and saying, quick, we need this data, and we could do it ourselves, that relieves the burden.

Also now more and more we're getting in now to try to provide them back information that ties all this stuff together along the lines that I've suggested. But that initial impetus was funding in Florida.

If we were to start it today and the funding imperative was not as crucial a factor as it was 20 years ago, I think the quid pro quo talk would be where we would focus. What is in this that we can do together that helps us together. How can we do things that help institutions and civilians? How can we do things that also answer questions that legislations and governors have. And, incidently,

what the federal government needs as well.

Does that kind of get at it a little bit? It was hard. I mean we met with local people and had to hammer back and forth. You know, there was a reluctance to report anything to the state. And tried to build relationships that we have to continually build. You have to continually grow around to make sure that we're all comfortable with one another.

COMMISSIONER HAYCOCK: Just a paragraph on -- you haven't mentioned the fact that --

MR. PFEIFFER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HAYCOCK: That's really important.

MR. PFEIFFER: Oh, maybe the segue into that, Kati, would be the pie chart that showed the highest attainment levels. Basically one of the things that we've done in looking at this is to look at participation in the labor market around those earnings levels, and there's some fairly interesting things that come out. This is basically the class of '96 that I just mentioned. By their highest levels of attaining. What are they earning in the Florida labor market ten years after they graduate from high school. There's some pretty good things. There's some things you expect, that people that have a bachelor's degree

earn more than people that drop out. That's a good thing.

But there are some things that are a little bit frightening and actually deal with the things that we were talking about here.

Twenty thousand dollars a year is the national average for all workers who are drop outs. That means after ten years, they've reached the pinnacle of their earning ability on the average. High school graduates in Florida whose highest level of attainment is a standard high school diploma, ten years after they graduated from high school are earning a little more than $28,000 a year in Florida.

The national census based average for all workers, regardless of age, including World War II veterans and the like whose highest credential is a high school diploma, is about $28,000. That means ten years out of high school if you haven't gone past your high school diploma, you have basically out stripped yourself in the labor market. You're not going to earn more unless you do more.

And what you see then in the people who have attained postsecondary credentials, based on the census data, is there's earning potential yet to go that has not yet been realized in those data.

Does that kind of get at it? The labor market stuff is great. We can -- when we talk about the kind of demands that I showed you, when we talk about occupations that are in demand, we can actually relate the disciplines that people take to the job.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: We're going to take one more question, and that does require data that --

MR. PFEIFFER: Kati unleashed me, sir, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: No, actually that's a very important point. There are other states that follow people into the labor force. In Texas we do have the unit record system that goes through K through 20 or whatever. So there are a lot --

MR. PFEIFFER: I've heard a lot with Texas on that.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Pardon?

MR. PFEIFFER: I've heard a lot with the state on that.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I think it's proving the point that several people made, that critical data is to inform policy and it needs to be with the student.

We have one more -- time for one more question.

COMMISSIONER GRAYER: We are reliving

history in some sense and I want to try to tie together the male education issue and the momentum one.

In the '40s after the GI Bill, there was a left behind group of population that wasn't going to college. And of course the solution was vocational high schools. A lot of money was poured into high schools that would train students when they came out for better and higher paying jobs, trades.

In today's market place, that might not be any longer enough. And that momentum question ties directly to the notion that high schools can gain in their high school experience associate level education and get that momentum, not only towards a high education degree but a higher paying job.

And, Governor Hunt, if you want to think about policy that can actually be enacted, money that could be directed into the nexus of high schools and community college systems, for-profits, but mostly community college systems where the large number of students actually end up, that would be a specific place to address a policy and financial commitment to gain momentum for boy, men students, towards a higher paying job in their high school life.

No different than going to a vocational

high school in 1947 so you could become a pipefitter and get a high school degree. And that would be a great place to think about a policy statement for our Commission.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Thank you. That's a really fine way to end. Does anybody have one more comment they want to make?

I can't think you enough for the presentation, Gentlemen. Personally, I happen to think this is one of the most important or urgent issues, whether you call it some fine tuning alignment or articulation or both, and it's very valuable that you've presented your stuff today, thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN MILLER: I'd like the spots to stay in its place and we'll be on a timely basis for the next presentation. There's a lot of material to cover, it's very critical and we're going to try to get out early. So let's pursue it.

(Off the record.)

CHAIRMAN MILLER: That's a powerful group you've got assembled there and we have a lot to cover. I think organizationally you're going to have a couple of people make presentations and have some questions, is that fair?

DR. EWELL: Yes, I'll explain that. Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: All right, good. Take off.

DR. EWELL: Okay, I'm Peter Ewell from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. I believe I've been selected to ride herd on this group, largely because for the last 25 years I've been involved with assessment and accountability conversations at ever level, with the federal government, 28 states, all of the regional accrediting organizations in one way or another and over 400 institutions.

And when I started this work I was as big as Peter McPherson. So it's been quite a ride in terms of having the scars to prove that.

I think there's good news and bad news in all of this. I think the bad news is this stuff is hard. Colleges have been allergic to it. It's been a real difficulty in getting the conversation started. It's hard work because the technical side of this, as you'll see, is not easy to assess collegiate learning.

The good news is I think that there are signs that we are reaching a tipping point where institutional leadership is stepping up and saying

we've really got to address that.

What I intend to do is -- you have some opening comments from me, which I'm going to only very briefly gloss to set the stage for this. And then we're going to do this in three blocks. What I'd like to do is have the folks who are involved in developing tools for gathering evidence of student learning make a presentation and that's Roger Benjamin and Steve Klein from Council on Aid to Education and RAND Corporation for the collegiate learning assessment, and George Kuh for the National Survey of Student Engagement.

Then you can question them a bit and we can have a discussion about tool development, if you will.

Then I'd like Peter McPherson from NASULGC to go because I think he's advancing what is, I think, a fairly unprecedented proposal where colleges and universities are taking the lead on trying to come out on this issue. And then turn to Anne Neal and Kevin Carey to talk a little bit about the kinds of things that parents and trustees and so on want to know and some of the vehicles for getting that done. Do that as a block and then you can discuss it. That's the choreography for how I want to work this thing.

Let me start out by saying that, Mr. Chairman, you billed this session assessment and accountability. It said on my program simply accountability. We certainly are going to be talking mostly about assessment. But I want to remind the Commission that there are other things that we ought to be accountable for, too. Even though the center of gravity, if you will, of this stuff is going to be about the bottom line of learning.

And you made a commitment, or at least the beginning of a commitment, with your I'll connect the dots that you used to do the stickies.

The primary priority is really the one of getting a larger proportion of our young adults to a postsecondary credential and then picking up on what Jim Duderstadt said yesterday, with a credential of world class quality. And so, you know, you have to put all those things together and the assessment part of the conversation is not only do they get through but how do we know that we have something of value at the other end.

And I just want to consistently remind you that if that is the national goal of moving more people to a credential of quality, you need to have a number of things in place. First of all, and I won't

spend any time on this, it's in the testimony and you've heard it, we're not doing so well with that. There's some troubling signs in terms of international comparisons that we're falling behind in terms of credentialling. We're now number seven in the world. There's some softness in the international assessment data that indicates that the credentials may not be as valuable as they once were. You've all seen the National Assessment of Adult Literacy data. What you may not have seen is the few samples of college students that took that. And they did a little better but they didn't do nearly as well as I would have liked them to have done in that exercise.

The first point I'd like to make is that we still don't know anything systematic as a nation the way we do for K-12 with me, about what that level of learning looks like. Peg Miller and I did a demonstration project about 18 months ago with five states that I think demonstrated that we could have profiles of learning that could fulfill that role at the state level. I think that it essentially proves that it could be done. I think some very simple things could extend that work if there were, for example, a pot of money at the federal government level that would match state efforts in trying to

gather those kinds of data, and so that they could benchmark their progress. That would be a good thing.

I think that we could extend the ceiling of the National Assessment of Adult Literacy into higher levels of skill than are now tested for, so that we can see what the educational capital looks like at the high end, at the world class end, as Jim was talking about. And extend the sample sizes so that states can get some of that information, too.

And all of that is tied in with certainly something that I very much support, which is a National Longitudinal Student Tracking Capacity that needs to be tied, as Jay said, to the state level as well. Because the states are really where the action is on this.

Now, let me turn to the fact that graduating more citizens with a credential is our collective goal. But different institutions can contribute to that collective goal in different ways. And I think that we need to appreciate that we have a diverse higher education system that's been doing very well by us. And that the kinds of contributions that individual institutions make are going to be different in that regard.

One way of taking that into account is the

value added kind of model that we'll hear some about. But I think that I learned enough in this business to know that a robust college level assessment system is one that's going to be tailored to that institution if its faculty is going to make any difference.

So everybody ought to be accountable for documenting what their contributions are to that bottom line. The way they do that ought to be benchmarked in some way to some external standard. But I don't think that you should be expecting a cookie cutter approach with regard to assessment because that's not going to get faculty involved.

I think another example in here is -- or another point in here is that we do have, despite the sort of glacial progress on this issue, a number of pretty good examples of what an assessment system could look like at the institutional level that informs good practice and discharges accountability. But there are very, very few incentives in the system right now for colleges to be any good at this. The presidents aren't rewarded for it. It's a thing you have to do. It's not something that is like winning football games and like bringing in research stars and so on. So we need to pay attention to the question of what is going to get institutional leaders to sit up

and take notice. And I'll have a thought about that in a minute.

So what to do. I think that one of the pieces here, accreditation got beat up pretty bad in some of the conversation around yesterday and in some of the paper that was flying. But I think we do need to recognize that what progress has been made in this issue over the last ten years is largely attributable to regional accreditation. I mean they have kept the issue alive. They have been responsible for what has happened on college campuses in all of this. And I think that they need to get some credit for it and I think we need to build on that base.

Because accreditation is terribly under capitalized to do this job. There really is not much resource there in terms of teams that know what they're doing when they go to a campus and then try to look at what a college is up to in terms of the basic sort of research capacity for knowing how to assist institutions to move along that path and so on.

So you might give some thought to saying if the federal government is going to rely on this particular mechanism to move forward, how are you going to get them up to a point where they can do it very, very well.

If that were the case, I think that you would want accreditors to do some additional things that they do not now all systematically require. One is, as I mentioned, to benchmark -- ask institutions to benchmark what they do to some external standard. It doesn't all have to be the same. But I think that it is incumbent upon institutions to be able to show that they are measuring up to something that is other than what their faculty says is the level that they want to be. And I think also accreditors, and they're coming pretty close to this now, should publicly disclose those results or should at least have the institutions publicly disclose those results. Those are all conversations that you moved toward I think yesterday.

Finally, let me say that we've made a lot of progress in the technology of all of this and you'll hear some of this in a minute. But I want to remind you that it's not just all about technology. The measurement instruments are only a small part of the problem. That we have instruments that you're going to be hearing about that I think are the best there are that we currently have. That doesn't mean that they can't be made better. That doesn't mean that there aren't a lot of other things that are

beginning to emerge to take advantage of web based technology, of the simulation capacity that we can use, and that aren't widespread. So I think that you shouldn't confine yourself to these particular ways of doing things in thinking about it.

Most importantly of all, I think -- I've been saying this for years, we've had a lot of data and we haven't been using it. We've had a lot more information than we've had the political will to do something with. And I say political saying that not just in terms of what people in legislatures are doing, but in terms of institutional leaders. And that's why I find Peter McPherson's proposal intriguing. Because I think that this is one that may be showing a bit of a change in the way that goes.

Last comment. There's a building constituency I think of presidents who are willing to take risks on this and, Bob Zemsky, it's because of the market. It's because I think they're saying we need to send market signals that we're responsive to this stuff and people are beginning to ask for it. So I think that we're going to have a growing groundswell of the public asking questions like what's your NSSE results look like, how are you doing on the CLA? And that that may be moving things forward.

With that, let me turn it over to Roger Benjamin of Council on Aid to Education and Steve Klein from RAND.

DR. BENJAMIN: Thank you, Peter. And I want to thank Mr. Miller and the Commission for this opportunity to talk a little bit about the CLA.

I chose in our brief comments to focus on the principals, the structured focus, some findings and Steve Klein, my colleague, who is the research director of the Council for Aid to Education is going to talk about that. And then I'll talk a little bit about where we are and the next steps.

I hope you've all got the slides that we're going to be briefly speaking from. And at the end there's some frequently asked questions. No approach is without flaws and issues to deal with and I've listed some of the basic questions there. So I'm going to start with Steve.

DR. KLEIN: Thank you. And thank you for inviting me.

There's a very basic principal in testing which goes something like this. What you test and how you test will influence what teachers teach and students learn. I'll repeat that. What you test and how you test will influence what teachers teach and

students learn.

And that principal effects throughout the whole education system. Twenty-five years ago we had the senior partners of the major law firms in California and other states were very concerned about the product that was coming out of the law schools because they were spending so much time teaching these law school graduates how to be lawyers. The other end of the spectrum was there are many people in the minority bar who were concerned that the kinds of questions that were being asked might be fine for an appeals court but didn't have anything to do with the store front law that they were practicing.

And they got together, and I'm sensitive to this because of Governor Hunt's question earlier about how did this all come about, how were you able to achieve all this. Well, these two factions, these two opposite ends of the political spectrum got together and said what we should do is we should build problems or performance tasks that students would take on the bar exam. And include those on the exam and score them. These problems would have to do with practical applications. So students would have to write a letter to an opposing counsel or to a client or do a points in authority speech, something that

actually lawyers do. And we put that on the bar exam and where did we get the pushback? The pushback came from the deans of the law schools who said we don't teach this. And the chairman of the committee, I'll never forget this, said now you will.

And that's what I mean about the tail wagging the dog. I have to mention that the Chairman of this Commission is from Texas and Texas, on their bar exam, they have a question about oil and gas leases. Trust me, the students in Texas study oil and gas leases. Not a surprise.

So what you put on your exam, what you test and how you test for it in terms of the kinds of measures that you use is going to influence construction.

Now with that in mind, let me turn to my presentation. What I'll talk about are some of the principals driving the kinds of measures we're using, what distinguishes this feature from some other measures that are out there. Given the amount of time we have, I won't say too much about the measures themselves, but we have those materials available for you. I'll talk a little bit about reporting results and then I'll turn it over to Roger to finish off.

And since you have all the slides in front

of you, I won't spend a lot of time on them. We can go to page 2 and talk about one test cannot assess overall quality. It would be ridiculous to suggest that one measure or even a battery of measures is going to assess all the things that higher education strives to achieve. It doesn't make sense to use one test and say this is how good your school is based upon this test. Colleges have different missions, students have different majors, the situation is very different than what we see in K-12 where there's a unified curriculum, basically, and so on. So it doesn't make sense to talk about that.

But the fact that you can't measure everything doesn't mean you can't measure some things. So some things are important that do cut across institutions. When you look at the mission statements of universities and colleges and schools, they talk about a number of things that they want all their students to be able to do. Included in some of those things are things like writing and critical thinking and problem solving, so on. And those are things that cut across disciplines. They're not tied to a single discipline. And if they are important, why not measure them.

So with that in mind, you ask the question

if we are measuring them, how do you go about doing it and what kinds of things are you going to look at? And in order to do that, you need benchmarks. Because you can't measure progress unless you know where you start. It's that simple. You can't talk about improvement unless you have some baseline to see how much you've improved from.

And so you need some baseline measures. And the kinds of questions that you want to ask is how much did our students improve? And you also want to know, is that improvement average, is it good, is it not so good? So you need to have some sort of benchmark to compare our improvement to somebody else's improvement to get some sense of what's going on. Is it adequate?

My fourth point in terms of principals driving the CLA is you have to use the results appropriately. We did not see the results being used to rank or rate schools. We haven't measured everything that's important. We've measured some of the things that are important but not everything that's important. I wouldn't use these tests to rate schools by themselves. But I don't see why you couldn't include this information as part of an overall index system. Like many things -- you're

going to look at access, you're going to look at graduation rates and so on. One of the things that you might look at is the kinds of results that we're talking about. So it's one of many things.

And it can be used to identify effective practices, it could be used for -- the results can be used to improve learning and instruction. And my point about it affects what's studied and what's taught.

In order to have measures that will do all these things, they've got to be valid, they've got to assess important skills that are relevant to what students need. And it's not just what they need in their major, but as citizens. To be able to function in our society and to be able to help in our society, people need to have certain types of skills that we expect of our college graduates.

The test has to be fair. It has to be given under standardized conditions. It has to be calibrated so the scores aren't effected by somebody having an easier or more difficult test. People in my field spend a lot of time doing that, worrying about those kinds of issues. And it has to be cost effective.

In the past it was generally prohibitive

to use open-ended measures on a large scale SA test, constructive response kinds of measures. That has changed. We now can do that very well. We train people how to be readers and we do it -- they can do their reading. I must say that Peter was involved in that recently, sat in on one of our training sessions for readers. And in those sessions, which I think Peter would agree, it's pretty rigorous training.

One of the first things we do is we have the readers take the test themselves. So they get a feel for the perspective -- what the students are like. And, Peter, I have your results. So we'll talk about that later.

There's certain features of the measures that are different than what you'd normally see when you think about large scale tests. We rely, like I said, on open-ended measures. They're work samples of the kinds of tests that we'd expect somebody to be able to do. They're engaging. Students are drawn into them. They're applicable to students who have different majors, that cut across the whole spectrum. The school is the end of the analysis, we're not really focusing on students, individual students, although we give them their results back. Our primary interest is on how well the school is doing.

We have a very large battery of measures. We can't give all of them to every student. And so we use a technique called matrix sampling. Some of you who are familiar with NAPE, we do the same thing on NAPE. So it's using that same methodology, quite frankly. Having each student take only a portion of the total battery and then putting the results together to get a score for the school.

It's all paperless. It's paperless test administration, scoring and reporting. We control for input, which is also a distinguishing feature. So we're not saying, you know, here is your score relative to all the other schools on some absolute scale. What we're saying is how well are you doing relative to the input that you have. Where did your students start and how much progress did they make. So we're focusing on improvement and on progress. And we're seeing whether your progress is consistent with that of other institutions that are like yours.

And so we're reporting results in terms of value added. We use different kinds of measures. We have essay kinds of prompts, make an argument, break an argument, we have these performance tasks which are these real life types of problems, these work sample type problems. And to give you a little feel for it,

on page 5 there's a sample prompt of the kind of essay that we're using. Where we give students a short quote or statement and then we ask them to defend their -- agree with it or disagree and explain why. What's their rationale. And we scored that in terms of whether they can express their ideas, whether they can back up their ideas and so on. We could talk about the details in scoring.

If you look at page 6, there's another kind of prompt called a break in argument prompt where it gives students an argument, it's laid out and then we ask them to critique it. What's right or wrong about it. For example, they might discover that a person is assuming that correlation means cause, which I heard a little bit about this morning actually, listening to some of the statements. But we can talk about that, too. I'm taking on more than I can handle probably here.

And then the performance test, which you've got to see to appreciate. What the students get is a computer screen, when they're looking at their computer screen, on the left hand side of the screen there's the question, a play in which to record their answers and on the right hand side of the screen there's what we call a document library. And it has

various documents that they look at and that they have to integrate the information from in order to answer the question. And so they might be working with letters, newspaper articles, research reports, so on, a whole variety. We purposely make what's on the right hand side of the screen very diverse. And they have to integrate information from different documents to present a coherent argument. So that gives you a feel for what the performance tests are like.

We use two definitions of value added, both are important. One is how much improvement occurs within the institution over time. So between freshman and senior year. How much gain is there on these measures.

The second definition has to do with whether that improvement is more or less than what you'd expect given the improvement at other institutions. Both are definitions of value added, both are important.

If you look at figure 1, and we're sorry about the size of this, but each of the -- along the X axis, the horizonal axis at the bottom is the students' ACT score at the school. So it's the mean ACT score at the school. If the school uses the SAT, we convert it over to the ACT. So the X axis is the

ACT score average at the school, the vertical axis, Y axis, is the CLA score. Each of those circles represents a college. And the circle that's filled in, the dark circle, is your school. So this is a sample school report showing where you are.

And if you look at this, you can see that there's a pretty strong relationship between a school's average ACT score and its score on our measures.

But some schools are above the line and some schools are a little bit below that line of the expected. And if they're well below or well above, you might want to take a look. Now, this picture on page 7 is for freshmen. So this is before the school had an influence. And what you're seeing is some students are doing better than others, or some schools are doing better than others, which may be due to something in their selection process and not necessarily they're imposing it but self-selection as well.

So there's something going on. Schools don't actually start at the same place. And you can see there's quite a range. Those of you familiar with the ACT scales can see there's quite a range here in terms of the schools in our sample.

Turn to the next page, page 8, the -- now the figure goes from blue to red and we're talking about seniors. This has nothing to do with blue states and red states, trust me on that.

They have the same picture and your school is again showing up as the solid dot. What this tells us, again, is that some schools are doing better than expected and some schools are not doing as well as expected, but most are doing about on the expected range.

The figure at the bottom of the page is the most important. This compares seniors to freshmen. And the first thing that jumps out at you is that the bar for -- the line for seniors is well above the line for freshmen. In terms of educational effects, these are big effects. The statisticians call this one and a half standard deviation difference, that's a big effect size.

To give you some feel for that, if you reduce class size in public schools in half for three years, you've got an effect size of a quarter of the standard deviation. This is six times bigger, okay?

So it gives you some feel for what's going on here. And we could talk about what the sources are. One of the other things which is interesting is

that schools that started off really well in terms of their freshmen, score higher than seniors at other schools. If you draw a horizonal line through this picture, you will see schools where the freshmen are doing better than the seniors at other schools. But relative to expected, the story is not so stark.

We could get into more detail about how to look at these things but I'm sensitive to Peter's request that we keep it short. But I do have your scores here, Peter. I'll turn it over to Roger now.

DR. EWELL: And, Roger, do pick it up, thank you.

DR. BENJAMIN: I guess the next slide on page 9 talks about the program participation and that just allows me to say that this -- we've been at this for six years. Peter indicated quite properly that this is hard work. But we are in our sixth year and the internet, when you get the test administration details worked out, does allow you to go to scale and we're doing that now.

But there are other potential sources or uses of the CLA that I list here. I'll just note quickly that systems like the University of Texas, the Council on Independent -- Consortium of Colleges lead by the Council of Independent Colleges are working

together to develop best practice responses to the scores that they get.

A couple of schools are investing heavily in new inquiry based pedagogical models and they're using the CLA to study the efficacy of these investments by comparative research projects.

You can, if you use more testing time, use the CLA for individual students' score results. And some institutions are clearly beginning to use this kind of approach for accreditation.

We're focused on our model. It's a value added model that looks at the institution and we're really focused on using it for improving teaching and learning. The market's going to decide how this kind of approach is used in the future.

Finally, the frequently asked questions do note a number of issues. Steve, say something about motivation which is one topic that always comes up and then we'll quickly turn it over.

DR. KLEIN: Right. One question that always comes up is student motivation. There are many aspects to that. One is if we can get the students into the room to take the test, motivation generally is not an issue because the test is so engaging. You walk in, you give the test and you can hear the

computer keyboards going almost right away.

Nevertheless, students who are more highly motivated probably do better. That makes sense. When we ask students how hard they tried, we see a relationship, not a very strong relationship, but there is some relationship between their scores and how hard they said they worked. But that's after the fact. We don't know if that's just saying that, you know, they saw the problem, saw how hard it was, they say, well, I didn't try that hard.

So we don't know which came first. But nevertheless, let's assume for the moment that motivation is a factor. It's certainly true in K-12 education that motivation is a factor and people say, well, you can look at state test scores when students aren't motivated. There's no stakes for the students to take the test. Except for a high school graduation test, there is no stakes attached to NAPE or statewide tests, whether the TOS in Texas or California's test or whatever it is.

One assumption which is made is that, well, that's probably true across schools and states in the same way. That why would we think that motivation is higher in some places than it is in others. Well, that's probably not a terribly safe

assumption, but it's probably not terribly wrong either.

So on that scale. The other part though is some schools may start including these measures in capstone courses. And the students could be highly motivated. And we think that would be wonderful, if schools started doing this. And as schools' scores went in, in part, because they're teaching this and requiring the students to be able to write well, what's so wrong with that?

So we can talk in more detail about motivation but there's many aspects to it. But I think it's probably a good thing that motivation has some impact on this.

DR. EWELL: Let's turn to George Kuh from Indiana University, the needed Hoosier in the room, to talk about the national survey of student engagement.

DR. KUH: Thank you, Peter. I want to thank the Chairman and the Commission for a chance to be with you this morning. And we're delighted you're in Indianapolis, home of a number of motor races, the 500 mile race. We do grand prix events here and so on. And this is a town where a lot of people know a lot about fast cars. And one of the things they've learned over the years is that just racing doesn't

make a car go faster the next time. You can figure out where you are in the pack after a race, but knowing it doesn't necessarily tell you what you need to do to go faster the next time.

Go faster to perform better requires the review of lots of things. Many of which are evident long before a race starts. How the car is built or set up, the race track conditions, the preparation of the driver, the racing team and so on. And so it is with assessing and improving the quality of undergraduate education. We certainly need good outcome measures like CLA and the other things that are out there and are coming along.

But knowing the result of a race, knowing the test score doesn't point you to the kinds of things that teachers and learners have done to produce the test scores. That's the reason the Baldrige criteria, for example, exquisitely requests the linkage between processes and outputs. You can't increase quality or efficiency appreciably without having those connections.

And so we need to know how students spend their time and what institutions devote their resources to in order to meaningfully connect test scores, outcome measures, with the learning activities

associated with the scores.

For the last seven years my colleagues at Indiana and our kind of sister counterpart at the University of Texas at Austin have been collecting data annually from hundreds of thousands of students at hundreds of colleges and universities around the country to discover the extent to which students and institutions are doing the things that matter to desired outcomes of the college. And these institutions, not all but a lot of them, in increasing numbers, are actually using the data to change what they do.

I have submitted, as others, written testimony and a pile of other materials that describe these two projects, the National Survey of Student Engagement, NSSE. And I'm speaking today also for Kaye McClenny who directs the community college survey of student engagement, the CCSSE. Both of these ask very similar, in fact there's substantial overlap intentionally, questions about student engagement. And by that we're talking about the time and effort that students spend on things that are related to desired outcomes of college.

And the reason we're spending time talking about student engagement is because not only do we

have direct links with outcomes but there are other issues like graduation rates, student satisfaction and so on. The premise is really simple. The more time -- very complicated algorithm, the more time students spend studying, the more they learn. The more they practice and get feedback, very important, the quality of the writing or problem solving, the more adept they become in these areas. The very act, Lee Shulman our friend says, of being engaged as to a foundation of dispositions that people can call on the rest of their lives for learning, personal development and so on. These two surveys are relatively short, intentionally so. And they're, for that reason, relatively inexpensive to use. They collect information though about a variety of activities about which we need to know more. Reading, amount of writing, amount of -- the nature of students' interactions with their teachers inside and outside the classroom, with diverse peers and so on.

But most important, institutions when they get the data can take almost immediate action to address areas where they're not performing very well. So this is not a battery of instruments, tests for example, like CLA that assess outcomes directly. But they provide information every school needs if they're

going to try to do something about the outcomes.

Both these projects are now self-supporting. Both were generously supported by foundations, the Pew Charitable Trust, the Lumina Foundation for Education and so on, but today the 560 schools that are using NSSE this spring, they're willing to pay for the data because they find it, we think, so useful.

We were talking about technology a moment ago. I should mention that we're surveying about a million randomly sampled students this spring and most of those students are going to respond on the web. In fact, over the last seven years the proportion of students responding via the web has flip-flopped. It was 20 percent in 2000 and now it's 80 percent and growing.

Well, why are schools paying for the data? Because we present it in user friendly format. We make the data almost impossible to ignore when it hits the campus because of the kind of benchmarking efforts that are used. And the benchmarks are differentiated according to schools with different sizes, different missions, different types of students. And so institutions can quickly identify areas where their students, relative to others, are not performing well.

And we provide peer comparisons. So the University of Michigan is not necessarily comparing itself against Wabash College but it's looking at Ohio State -- or I guess Michigan has no peers, excuse me.

COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: At least not in Ohio.

DR. KUH: Small colleges can pick aspirational groups or groups that they think they are pretty much like. And schools get their own data. And with the Institutional Review Board approval, they can actually link individual student data back -- we were hearing about the Florida experience, at the college level they can link into the data back to the course taking patterns of students, other experiences that they've had and so forth. It's very important for faculty, for example, to see data broken out by major field. Because now we have the faculty member's attention, whereas an institutional number, my eyes glaze over.

Now, just because a school knows where it's falling short doesn't mean that it's going to address that area or certainly resolve it. But it's a lot more likely, I think as Peter indicated earlier, that faculty are going to pay attention if they can identify their students, their discipline and compare

it against places that are like them. Peers working elsewhere.

I might just mention, for example, a group of research universities, AAU institutions, have been looking at student level scores for the last several years as part of a consortium. This does not get reported publicly, but that means the folks at Colorado Boulder can go in and look at their English majors and compare them against Indiana University, University of Wisconsin and so forth. There's some state systems -- I shouldn't say some, there are many state systems now using NSSE and CCSSE in some form. Kentucky, for example, adds some NSSE data to its own alumni satisfaction survey to feed one of its five key indicators of progress. The University of Texas system is using it; as is, may I say, A&M in the room? South Dakota. The Florida Department of Community Colleges of Workforce Education also use NSSE data, along with student academic progress indicators.

Two short relatively straightforward surveys. But we don't prefer to think about these as surveys. We think about these as a way of changing the way we think about what matters to undergraduate learning and personal development. It's a different way to talk about what matters to students' success in

college.

And we're learning some things, for example, about what strong performing institutions do. Places that have higher than predicted graduation rates and also higher than predicted engagement scores. With the great support, generous support of Lumina, we studied 20 very diverse kinds of institutions around the country and we report some of that. We've got a book out, I spared you that, but we have a set of small very short briefs that can be used with different groups on campus to talk about these common factors and conditions. Like setting forth clear pathways or, as we heard earlier, maybe how does one negotiate the climbing wall when one hits college?

There are specific things that institutions do and some of these -- most of these institutions also had another common feature which we ended up calling positive restlessness. We've got a longer generic term for that. But I mean back to when Jim Duderstadt was Provost, the Chief Academic Officer at Michigan, he along with his colleagues launched a very ambitious set of initiatives. And Michigan, as an example, conducted six major studies of the qualities of undergraduate experience over about a 15 year period. We can see this happening at these other

high performing institutions.

Another thing we're learning, just recently with a smaller project, is that engagement, that is, these kind of -- being highly involved in the kinds of activities that NSSE and other instruments measure, seem to benefit lower ability students more than the highest ability students. In other words, there's a compensatory effect here. Students coming in with lower ACT scores, for example, who are more engaged, see their grades end up being higher than you would otherwise predict. This is very powerful and very important, given the kinds of challenges we're facing with a broader, deeper pool.

Well, what can the Commission do? You've been told to do a lot of things, I'll add three more. First, I think you could recommend that the Department of Ed and other funders, private foundations as many have already stepped up, dedicate more resources to further develop and refine these kinds of instruments and develop additional ones. We need more support to do validation and data integration. I mean we've seen how the state of Florida has done this, we need to do the same thing in higher education. This will help us learn more about the teaching and learning practices that work better in different kinds of settings, with

different kinds of students.

Second, you can endorse or somehow push, induce, require the development and adoption of a common template that colleges and universities can use to display student success indicators. I mean we've talked about some of these generic ones, persistence in graduation rates, could include CLA and other outcome measures, engagement scores. But we also ought to see things like transfer rates and course completion rates and degree/certificate completion rates and so on. This will allow students, parents, other interested parties to better understand what's going on inside an institution and look across institutions.

And finally, I was taken with -- Governor Caperton spoke of a bread sandwich, you know. And without teaching and learning, you know, inside, we don't know very much about what's going on. But we've also have to know more about the lunchroom in which this sandwich is being consumed. Or more about the race track, if you will. Because these vary, these conditions vary from one place to another. What I'm talking about here is we aren't going to improve the quality of undergraduate education unless we take cultural change on college campuses seriously. That's

the biggest challenge in my mind. It's an amorphous challenge, but virtually every study of a high performing organization in the for-profit or not-for-profit-sector comes back to this same conclusion, that it's the culture that these organizations create that makes the difference in terms of whether teachers will take -- I mean I'm astounded to learn that the lowest expectations for high school student performance are by their teachers themselves. Families expect more, the students themselves expect more. And as we've been talking about, this takes leadership and so on.

There are frameworks to do this work. We ought to know, for example, whether the curriculum is organized in a way and delivered in a way that facilitates students' success or create obstacles. We know, for example, that math course, Gateway math classes on college campuses, can be a huge block for students moving through.

Well, let me just conclude by saying that NSSE and CCSSE are widely used we think because they're relatively inexpensive. They make them easy, the data easy to interpret. And they provide, we're told, meaningful relevant performance indicators. They're not perfect but no instrument, as Steve said, is.

But in combination with outcome measures and other performance indicators, student engagement data revealed the means and the methods that can improve many dimensions of student success and institutional performance.

DR. EWELL: Thank you for both of those. Let's open it up for at least a bit of discussion. Jim?

COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: Yes, I want to commend the groups because I think these are very valuable tools. I'm trying to figure out in my own mind whether if we use, for example, magnetic resonance imaging as an analogy, whether we're at the research stage in understanding human anatomy or whether we're ready to, in a clinical practice, diagnose.

But let me kind of put one issue on the table. For the last several years I've been chairing a National Academy study that's been looking at the impact of technology and we've held hearings and meetings on a number of college campuses. And one of the first things that always comes up is how different the current generation of student is and how they learn and how they think.

Multi-processing, always on communication

skills with instant massaging. Taking a lot of different things and putting them together, rapid context switching. These are kind of the world in which these kids live because they've been born and raised in a media intensive environment. And it's not the same way we think, it's not the same way we teach and it may not be the same things that we're trying to measure. But for these folks in a very rapidly changing global society based on knowledge, maybe those are better skills.

And so the fundamental question I have is whether we're still trying to measure skills that are valuable in the 20th century world taught by 19th century institutions for citizens of a quite different society. And with that in mind, I very much support the last recommendation you made. I think we've got to stress the importance of investing heavily in understanding how what we're learning about cognitive science, you know, the kind of world these kids are living in and the way that they're evolving, fit into higher education. That's going to take research. And I think that will be very important to you folks, but I think it has to be done. I'd be interested in your responses.

DR. KLEIN: Two responses. First is we

agree with you a hundred percent. That's why the document library lets students use the computer and they have the document library where they're working with very different documents.

We used to worry about whether this was measuring the same thing as what students were getting on paper. That question is long gone. Because this is the way they learn.

The other thing is that by looking at the schools that are well above or well below that regression line, that expectation line, tells you where to look. Let's go to those schools, let's do the research of going to those schools that are well above or well below and see what they're doing differently. And let's take a look at NSSE scores at those schools. And that's why -- George and I have published together, so we're on the same page in this stuff. That these things are complimentary measures, it's not one or the other. That we think that this is the kind of thing to look at as to why schools are above or below and maybe visiting some of those schools.

DR. EWELL: Somebody made the R&D point yesterday about only one percent or something like that in education compared to some others. I think

that is one that you should flag. It makes an awful lot of sense to me.

DR. BENJAMIN: Peter, just one more response to Jim because it's a good question.

I think, to me, my response is that in the 21st century the focus really needs to be a lot more on teaching students how to think. The focus is on equipping the next generation to better able to access structure and use information than only prove facts, which is kind of the way we learned.

COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: Yeah. Well, our sense is these kids benefit much more from what used to be called constructionist learning because they build their own learning environments. They're very sophisticated and they may out pace our faculty.

COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: A couple of -- an observation and then a question. I really want to commend both RAND and George for really doing some very important work, the sorts of things we've been talking about in the context of what's necessary for institutions to do to determine the learning environment.

And I also think it's interesting that as many schools, 500 plus in the case of George and 100 plus in the case of RAND, have gone into this without

anyone telling them they have to do it. They've done it because they want to improve the learning environment and they want to know how the students are doing.

My question is how -- and I'm not sure what the rules are in either case, but one, are schools encouraged or discouraged from publishing the results of these tests, number one. And number two, do you think it's a good idea to have these results, for example, posted on the school's web site or the department's web site?

DR. EWELL: Let's start with CLA.

DR. BENJAMIN: I mean we certainly don't publish the results. But the University of Texas system recently published their results in an extraordinary report that Gerri Malandra, I don't know if Gerri's here today, I think had a lead role in.

And that's a good example. I mean it was a very sophisticated effort. And I commend them for that. And I think we're going to begin to see more of that. Why not? Now, it's tricky business, admittedly. But I think it's a good idea.

DR. EWELL: George?

DR. KUH: The CCSSE project, the community college project, was founded with the principal that

these data would be public. And institutions can go into the CCSSE web site and manipulate data and actually do some of their own comparisons. So some of these data are public.

NSSE data we strongly encourage institutions to report. And so out of the 560 doing -- by the way, over 1,000 different four-year schools have used NSSE. So we're at about close to three-quarters of the undergraduate FDE being represented over the course of the project.

Earlham College, Doug Bennett I see is sitting behind me, they put all their data on the web site as does Elam University. You can go into the University of North Carolina web site and if you've got a few days, you can find the data. That's true. And that's not a slam at UNC because they were in this from the very beginning.

Our institutional research guy at my place got a call five years ago from a father in Ohio and said I found the North Carolina data, I got the Ohio University data and I'm looking for your data, I can't find it. And our guy didn't know what to say. Because no one had ever called him before. And it took us three weeks to go up the food chain to get permission to send out the data.

So as with other statements, Peter's opening comment, we are dead set against using these data for simple rankings. This stuff is too complicated, too complex, too interesting and potentially too powerful for institutional chains then to reduce it to a single number.

So we'd like to see the data used publicly. My notation about a common template would help schools do this. There is danger lurking in these weeds, however, because the more complicated stuff we put out, the easier it will be for people to misunderstand what the data really represent. And so along with the common template we need some, if you will, rules of engagement. Especially for the media. What can you say and what should you not conclude from these numbers at this point in time.

Just finally, it's unfair to ask a school the first time they see the data, in my opinion, to go public very soon until they understand what the numbers mean. What's behind the numbers. You want to give us a chance to figure out what's driving this so that we have a chance to respond.

COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: Are you trying to -- just to follow up, it's obviously extraordinarily valuable to the institution because it can judge the

value of what it's doing. But are you thinking about some way in which if the data is published that it can be interpreted you think in a fair and reasonable way by members of the public who are not statistical experts and don't understand regressions and standard deviations and all the rest?

DR. KUH: You're asking are we doing it? Would we like to do it? The answer is, yes, we would like to do it. We've stopped short of doing it at the present time until I think institutions have more confidence that they can go forward without being hammered by a local reporter or some other group.

DR. EWELL: Nicholas Donofrio.

COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: Yes, just a very simple question and then I'd like your observations. I'll pick up on Jim's point. I'm from industry and I'm terribly worried about what you're preparing for us in terms of how we put these young folks to work.

And while all of these measurements are encouraging to me in many ways, since they do address outcomes, individual outcomes, and there's another important attribute if you want to be in the 21st century, as best I can tell, and it's called collaboration. Can either of you address that? And I'd like your comments and thoughts about what are you

doing about that or is it maybe not as important as I think?

DR. KUH: NSSE has a handful, eleven items that address active and collaborative learning, that is, how a faculty member would set up small groups of students in class and also create assignments outside the class that would bring them together. And this is particular important in the context of working with diverse peers.

So we asked a set of questions about this. It's a short instrument. We'd like to ask many more. But of course you see this stuff lining up exactly as you expect. Students who do more, report more active and collaborative learning. On the self-reported outcome side of this where we ask students whether they've developed a capacity to work effectively with others, the more active and collaborative learning you do, the more students say they're doing it.

So we have a process measure but we don't have the kind of outcome measure perhaps that you'd like.

COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: And I'll ask Steve and Roger, there's nothing inherent in the technology that could prevent doing that kind of thing on a task. It would be perfectly possible, would it not, to put

together --

DR. KLEIN: There's a whole field of assessment that has to do with assessment centers, which is basically what you're talking about. That there's no prohibition against our going into that area. We're not doing it right now. There's real mine fields in trying to do that in terms of whose work is it and so on.

But we have done research on that. Not as part in the higher education but in other areas. So there's really no prohibition against doing it.

One other thing to say though about reporting results, if you don't report results you're not going to have an impact. It's that simple. The only way you're going to have an impact is if you're going to get the results out there. First to the schools so they know how to do it and interpret it. And I'd agree with George on that. That this is an evolutionary thing. But eventually, down the line, if you really need to have an impact, you've got to be reporting results.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: George's institutions that reports the results would be the top institutions, we know that.

DR. KLEIN: Not necessarily. Not

necessarily because if we reported in terms of value added and improvement, it's not necessarily the top schools.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: No, his institutions though. Okay, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER VEST: Excellent presentation, very enlightening. As someone who loves data, I can't help but ask, are these data real?

DR. KLEIN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER VEST: Because I have never seen anything about real people that correlates that closely to a straight line. And in particular, let me finish my question.

And I want to learn more about the CLA, but things I know of from the past tend to look like a shotgun hit. Anything correlated with outcomes in college plotted against ACT or SAT scores. And a second part to this question, I think probably most of us are more familiar than anything with the data that appear in The Shape of the River by Bohn and Bach. And the number one lesson there that I took away at least is that as a predictor of an individual's performance, SAT or ACT's are not all that great. And that certainly is our experience at MIT.

But also in The Shape of the River of

course they show that the correlation for African-American and Hispanic American students was almost zero; whereas, there was a reasonably strong correlation for white and Asian students in outcome. I just wondered whether CLA has looked at the racial piece.

DR. KLEIN: The answer to the question is we have looked at them. The reason that this relationship is as strong as it is, is that we're using the school as a unit of analysis rather than the individual student --

COMMISSIONER VEST: That's what I suspected.

DR. KLEIN: Okay. If you use the student you would see -- it wouldn't look like a shotgun blast but it would like a much larger ellipse. It would look like a football in terms of the distribution.

DR. EWELL: Maybe one more question if anyone has it and then --

COMMISSIONER VEST: The racial correlation --

DR. EWELL: The question about the racial --

DR. KLEIN: Why don't we do that -- since Peter is short on time, we can talk about that. We

have looked at that question and the schools seem to behave the same way.

DR. EWELL: Bob Mendenhall.

COMMISSIONER MENDENHALL: I think these are great instruments. One of the challenges we have as a Commission is to remember that increasingly a large percentage of our student population are not traditional students in traditional classrooms. And both of these instruments kind of assume -- I mean I think they're very effective for traditional students. They don't work well for adult students or on-line students or students in other settings.

Are there any plans to adapt, modify or develop different instruments to address what's increasingly becoming a different kind of population in higher ed?

DR. KLEIN: I would take issue with that, Bob, because all of our stuff are delivered over the web. All these instruments that we've been talking about, both George and ourselves, are delivered over the web to students.

COMMISSIONER MENDENHALL: But, for example, adult students don't have meaningful ACT/SAT scores as a baseline.

DR. KLEIN: No, they don't, but we're

talking -- we have another measure that we can use for that purpose.

DR. EWELL: I think we need to move on. We have a lot to cover.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: And in community colleges. I'm sorry to say this quickly, but we're going to hear an alarm in a minute. It isn't because you're over time or anything. It's a city wide tornado alert that they practice on Friday mornings. So nobody move. Nobody move.

DR. EWELL: I'd like to turn now to Peter McPherson from NASULGC.

DR. McPHERSON: Well, excellent. It's good to be here and I, as all of you, thank you for the presentations just given.

Let me begin mentioning something a little different. I chaired the commission to look at study abroad over the last year appointed by Congress. The President proposed there would be a million students per year in ten years. I think some of you have seen that proposal. I strongly endorse it. I think talking about real change in our higher education system, this is the topic.

Let me talk about the discussion at hand today. Before you is a paper which we've discussed

within our board and some others. We went to all the presidents and provosts of the NASULGC institutions around the country. It is a draft in the nature of things, there will be lots of reactions to it. There will no doubt be other -- another paper and so forth. This isn't usually the process you'd find at Bank of America for example where I worked for a number of years. But it is in fact the way the Academy really engages. And I think it is critical to move some of this discussion in the Academy for, among other things, we'll put together some ideas which will help us improve student learning. As opposed to just being only of value to outsiders -- outside people and that, of course, itself is important.

Now, I would say, first of all, that the higher education community knows there are a bunch of issues, the graduation rates and a number of other things I could go into. But I would also say that I strongly believe the Academy, public higher education and other components are prepared to really get at these measures.

I was struck at Michigan State when I came there in '93 as President and was there 11 and a half years, there wasn't a major issue that we had before us, where people didn't say how does it impact the

students? And the biggest single asset in some ways for the Academy is the idealism of the commitment to have students learn more. Every time it doesn't work out for a student, there's a feeling that we weren't successful.

You hear various stories and of course it's not universal, but I've worked in government, I've worked in business and now for many years in the Academy. And there is a commitment to student learning, if you look at our history. We've got problems but I believe we're prepared to really move in and I hope the NASULGC paper reflects a deep belief in doing the very best for our students.

Now, what is suggested for consideration is a voluntary system that would potentially vary some by the type of institution. This was discussed at the executive committee of our provost a few weeks ago in San Francisco where I presented my views in a preliminary paper. They came out, as you'll see there, saying, look, we ought to really look at this. They have a summer meeting where all of the provosts would be together to do it. This paper, of course, pushing this on.

The paper suggests that you might look at a bundle. I appreciate George's presentation. It

does -- the correlation between student engagement and learning is clear. I do think the need that -- as part of a bundle, it does seem to be something that should be public.

I like a student engagement because, as George said, you can use it as an administrator and as a faculty. You said, okay, here's things that we can do.

It is certainly one of the interesting potential components of a bundle of accountability, if you will.

By the way, it seems to me the student might well define the package a little differently. I mean where the university cares about its students is the way they might think about it. And they would look at a school as whether or not there's student engagement.

Now, I do think that as part of a package, some way to assess competency is clearly a matter of importance. The CLA is out there in over a hundred schools. I think that Steve would probably say we need more data to figure out just what we're going to do with it, and so I'm not saying let's use the CLA. But I think some kind of competency measurement does make sense.

I was pleased that Steve spent so much time talking about the correlation between the SAT or ACT and the outcome of a competency test. In a little different context, we looked at this at Michigan State and compared ourself with universities that had approximately the same GPA test score entering and looked at graduation rates and so forth.

It is helpful and it does, if you fall well below or well above, it does tell you that. Now it may not tell you exactly in specificity as to what you might do to improve your score. Now there are some public information items that everybody -- that parents, legislators and I'm sure -- Jim Duderstadt and I have been to -- in fact we testified a long time ago, testified before our -- we felt accountable there, didn't we?

COMMISSIONER DUDERSTADT: That's when they had money.

DR. McPHERSON: That's when we wanted money, that's right.

But there's a bundle of data that the public probably expects. And there are problems with each but we -- the graduation type, I am intrigued with the unit record system and what's been shown in Texas that maybe there's a 20 point improvement. I

think too often we don't really say all the information, we don't report to the public all that we have.

So I believe there is a bundle of matters, we've laid it out to our grouping. We're working very closely to NACIQI. Between ourselves and NACIQI it basically is the four year and above public universities in this country. NACIQI, it's an important combination to do this. And I'm confident that in the weeks and months ahead we'll go through drafts and discussions but that a voluntary system looking at some expectation or variance by mission is out there. And I think it's very positive.

We are strongly against a federally mandated system. I think it would be -- the strength of American higher education system is its diversity. It's the vitality and the sterilizing fact. We have federal regulation, in my view.

I have asked Britt Kirwan to chair a committee on student learning and accountability. Britt was the President of University of Maryland, was then the President at Ohio State and is now back as the head of the Sister of Maryland, one of the true -- maybe he wouldn't want me to say it quite this way, but grand old men of public higher education. And

Sally Mason, the chair of the provost council of NASULGC will be on that committee. And David Shulenburger, the provost at Kansas. Has been provost there some 13 years. One of those folks that really was key working on accreditation. Will become on June 1 the Academic Vice President of NASULGC and David will be the key person working with this committee.

We've got something on the table. I've never put anything on the table in the Academy that didn't change some. Sometimes a lot. But I think that this is the process in which we need to engage people and I'm very happy to be here today. Thank you.

DR. EWELL: I warned you that I was going to do this, but before opening it up I want to ask a question.

Which is basically, we've heard proposals coming forward a lot. What would make us believe that this one is serious and it's going to happen?

DR. McPHERSON: Well, one, to my knowledge there has not been a -- NASULGC is the oldest public university association in the country. Some very strong members. It's significant that virtually all the publics are members of NASULGC. It has been clearly a very strong leading public university

association.

And it is true that some people may think we're kind of leading with our chin. Outside the Academy this may not seem to be, but within the Academy it is certainly that here's where we are, we've got this wonderful group of people to work on the committee, the provost. You'll hear more about this. I can tell you that while I expect to have these ideas change, I'm very serious about, as leader of NASULGC, getting this issue within the Academy.

DR. EWELL: Dr. Hunt?

COMMISSIONER HUNT: Dr. McPherson, I want to ask you if your association would be willing to give leadership in helping us get a national unit record system?

DR. McPHERSON: Well, what I've said here in the paper is that I am very interested in this. And I want to work through that issue a little bit more. There's some people in Congress I want to talk to. There's been an issue there.

I think the unit record system -- we need to figure out how to deal with privacy issues and some other matters. And rather than just endorse it here today, I'd like to work through those matters. But you'll hear more from me about the other --

COMMISSIONER HUNT: Well, I want to encourage you to do that. Now, we know we've got to change. We've got to move forward. The world's fixing to run off and leave us. And all of us have a responsibility here. So I just want to indicate to you how urgent I think this is. And really, seriously, it's a wonderful association and I'm a graduate of some of your institutions and proud of it.

But of all the associations in America, you all ought to give this leadership maybe more than anybody else.

DR. EWELL: Other questions?

DR. McPHERSON: It deserves a special, careful paper. It's very interesting. But I am very impressed by the numbers coming out of Texas. And you know the numbers are likely to be that great if you looked at it nationwide. So we don't want to shortchange yourself.

DR. EWELL: I would like to move on to the next speaker. Is there a question, I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: If you would, could you give us a time line for your consideration? You've said some decisions are likely to change, others would say this is a grand filibuster. When do you expect to have an answer? We're going to have an

answer in August.

DR. McPHERSON: I don't think we could expect to have an agreement of a voluntary system over here in three months. But I do think -- I do expect the committee -- we will continue -- this is something over the next several months we'll be more comfortable with. I wish I could tell you. I found when I tried to do that, the university, Michigan State University, that if I tried to set too firm of a date, it didn't help.

DR. EWELL: Again, I don't want to cut this off.

COMMISSIONER WARD: Peter, I would say I would join you and ask you in saying that the value of academic research, we're probably in a situation where there's a lot of known information that about the value of the data that we've heard today. But I know that you lead -- not lead, but there are some simple, maybe not so simple differences in how fast you go not only with your members but among members who are independents. But I do think that the idea of some sort of response, and maybe the Commission can help by stating kind of that there is value to the future of higher education, an almost indispensability to the future of higher education and that we, in a sense,

and the associations have to try our best to move it faster. Though it's fraught with difficulty. But it's your document, I suppose it will come to you.

DR. McPHERSON: Well, it's really, one, I recognize that if something is important to do, if you can do it quickly you ought to do it. Again, where you've got several thousand institutions, each of whom, as we all remember we're running these institutions we didn't really think we -- we felt some independence, you've got to work it through.

But let's look at this. It would be interesting what sort of reaction I get from having sent this to the presidents last night, a number of my board, a number of other people have seen it before, but it wasn't out there to everybody until last night.

I think this position is reasonable. It has a discussion tone, too, about it. But what we ought to realize, and I know all of you do, is there is a -- as this plan made earlier, about a commitment of individuals, overwhelmingly. And for the institutions to do a better job. You know, look what we've done in this country. I don't mean to have the past make excuses for the future, but of course if you go way back to the land grant system of 1862, the GI Bill. But more recently what happened to universities

in this country in the '60s and the '70s when you have an explosion of people going to -- in Michigan we talk about sort of the UAW family, that previously hadn't gone. Well, we've got some big challenges now, don't we?

All right, when I talk to my friends around the Academy, let's get at them. And this is one part of the issue. It's exciting really, I look forward to this discussion.

DR. EWELL: Bob, do you want to --

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Just to push it once more on a practical level, I guess, you know, at least -- I don't know if all the Commission members saw the earlier draft, I did for whatever reason. I think the draft that you circulated changed the discussion in all kinds of ways.

So I would -- I didn't mean that you needed to come to a redesigned system by August. But the more that you get the public commitment -- and I always remember the example that's often talked about about where the European Union came from, it actually came from a conjunction of three countries, very small Benelux countries. We don't talk about them any more that way but we did once.

The interesting thing about that agreement

is they all agreed that they were going to have Benelux and said to everybody else, now you work out the details. And in some ways you could read that in what he said. You didn't say it quite that way and I wish you would say it quite that way, but the more that you can be public and say that it isn't an issue of whether or not but how and when, I think that would help us that we could have some faith that this train was leaving the station.

DR. McPHERSON: Your comments are very helpful.

DR. EWELL: Thank you, Bob.

DR. McPHERSON: I do remember that history. It was interesting, wasn't it?

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MILLER: Well, as a known agitator, I want to commend you for taking the leadership less than three months or three months into the job. We're behind you, and probably pretty close. So congratulations on taking that leadership.

DR. EWELL: For the last block of the program we're turning to a slightly different set of issues and we'll have two speakers in succession and then open it up.

Anne Neal of the American Council of

Trustees and Alumni and Kevin Carey of Education Sector. You might explain a bit about what your organizations do so that people have some context. Anne?

MS. NEAL: Well, thank you so much. It's a real challenge to try to deal with accountability in ten minutes.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni has been around now for ten years. We were started to be a voice for alumni and trustees across the country for academic freedom, academic excellence and accountability. And in the course of the next few minutes, what I'd like to do is turn away a little bit from what are students learning to what institutions are teaching. Before the Commission is the question, how can we be sure that America's system of higher education remains the finest in the world and I would like to draw the Commissioners' attention to two other areas, academic quality and informed and effective governance.

One would think that these values would already be priorities in a universe responsible for preparing our next generation of leaders and citizens, but they are not. Students today in too many cases receive an education in name only. The pre-eminence

of our system of higher education is profoundly threatened by an academic culture that has fostered college curricula, where in the words of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, anything goes. Rampant grade inflation that undermines the quality and integrity of college instruction and the prevalent misconception to those who are vested with the ultimate authority for our colleges and universities, namely, college and university trustees.

According to a survey by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 84 percent of the public believes that a college degree is key to getting ahead. But nearly half, 40 percent, believes that the cost is not justified for what is received. And I think the public is right. Let me outline why.

It used to be that all colleges and universities in America insisted on a rigorous, sequential curriculum that ensured students a board general education in addition to the specialization provided by the major. Students were given a common educational foundation on which to build. This was truly learning for a lifetime.

But no longer. Nowadays, virtually unlimited choice has supplanted the concept of a

rigorous general education. The Hollow Core, a study by the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, surveyed the Big 10, Big 12, Ivy League and Seven Sisters, to see if they guaranteed exposure to broad areas of knowledge. And we looked at literature, composition, science, math, history, economics and foreign languages.

What we found was shocking. Even though there is a general consensus that college graduates must have analytical, writing and quantitative skills to participate fully in our contemporary economy, something that we've been hearing about this morning. Almost one third of the institutions surveyed had no specific writing requirement. Only 38 percent required a course in mathematics; 38 percent failed to require a natural or physical science; and not one demanded that its students study economics.

In a democracy citizens must be educated, familiar with their governing system and aware of their history. Yet a mere 14 percent of the colleges compel their students to study American government or history. We live in a global society increasingly shaped by actions and interactions of different cultures and civilizations. Yet nearly a quarter, 24 percent of the colleges surveyed do not require a

foreign language.

Today's colleges give the appearance of providing a core curriculum because they require students to take courses in several subject areas, the so-called distribution requirements. Within each subject area, however, it's not uncommon for students to have dozens, even hundreds of courses, from which to choose, many of them narrow and even frivolous. To use a local example, our study gave Indiana University a D for its general education curriculum since its graduates were not required to complete solid core courses in literature, government, history, economics, math or science.

Students can, however, take courses like History of Comic Book Art to satisfy the arts and humanities distribution requirement.

To prepare our next generation of citizens, a curriculum should be picked higher than the momentary tastes of 19 year olds. Democracy rests on the assumption that the citizens will be intelligent said educator Robert Maynard Hutchins. That intellects must be disciplined. They must know the difference between honest thinking and soft street, and between reasoning and rationalization. Only by disciplines that teach them these differences

can they hope to resist the demagogue and propagandist.

Another troubling current in higher education is grade inflation. With only a few exceptions, ACTA's report, Degraded Currency: The Problem of Grade Inflation, shows that persistent grade inflation exists in colleges and universities across the country. Borrowing, if I may from Garrison Keeler, in a world where everyone is above average, indeed far above average, high performance and hard work are undermined. When institutions are unwilling to distinguish among degrees of achievement, future employers, schools and students are left without a realistic picture of ability. Students have less motivation to achieve and we foster, I fear, a troubling need to rely on subjective criteria and connections.

And since grade inflation is not in fact uniform, it may subtlety encourage a shift away from the more difficult fields, math and science, towards those fields with easier grading, the humanities and social sciences. The problem of grade inflation, thus, may have a direct bearing on the supply of students with higher math and science skills, a national need acknowledged by Congress.

When all is said and done, these issues of quality and rigor go to a more fundamental problem, institutional accountability. Who is in charge? Whose minding the store?

It's our experience that too few trustees engage or understand what is happening on our college campuses. And this is not unintended. Trustees themselves deserve much blame for failing to step up to their fiduciary obligations. At the same time, the culture of the Academy strongly discourages that engagement. Rather than viewing them as a resource, higher education administrators and faculty often view trustees as meddlers or mavericks who job should be to put up and shut up.

Lay governance is designed to bring the informed perspective of citizens to the very heart of the university. However, experience shows that the full promise and actual practice of lay boards are often far apart.

If we are to remain the best higher education system in the world, trustees must address the key issues of cost, quality, and accountability and do so without being intimidated by academic insiders.

Faculty often claim that trustees who

engage in active stewardship violate institutional autonomy and academic freedom. But the unique management model of shared governance with faculty and administrative controls does not mean the academy is exempt from outside input. Institutional autonomy exists not as an end in itself, but as a means to protect the freedom of students and faculty to pursue the truth and to become educated for informed citizenship.

While certain governing boards including those at the University of Texas, George Mason and the State University of New York, have, I think, raised the bar for trustee engagement. Not all boards offer the same leadership. Regrettably there are far too few trustees who understand that tradition and shared governance does not supplant their ultimate authority and accountability.

So what is to be done? My statement for the record goes into a number of recommendations in great detail and it's my hope that the Commission will give serious consideration to them as it goes forward.

Let me now, for a few minutes, review a few of those. If you do nothing else, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni urgently ask the Commission to call upon the academic community, boards

of trustees, working with presidents and faculty to review and reform the general education curriculum.

At very little cost colleges and universities should engage in a process of curricular self-examination. The prevalent smorgasbord approach, allowing students to pick and choose among hundreds of courses, results in a hodge-podge that fails to prepare students for informed citizenship, diverse careers and lifelong learning.

The importance of a coherent connected curriculum has never been clearer since it gives students the broad based knowledge and skills necessary to adapt to changing situations and to compete in the global market place. Moreover, by focusing on a high quality and cohesive general education curriculum, higher ed can help to address the pressing needs in K-12. It's imperative that what students are asked to do and learn in high school be connected to postsecondary course work and assessments. And there's no better place to do it than in a general education curriculum.

This I would say is a different twist on the momentum issue that was raised earlier today.

Call for an end to grade inflation. There are good solutions to this pernicious trend already.

Princeton has halved the number of A's it awards to undergraduates. Colorado now has instituted a policy amongst its publics that they will publicly distribute the grade distributions.

Call for an end to federal accreditation. While the system of accreditation evolved to assure educational excellence and competence, there is quite a bit of evidence that in fact it undermines those values and effective governance as well. Under the accreditors watch, and I know you all have dealt with this at some length, colleges have allowed academic standards to slide, the grade inflation come out and accountability to suffer. And when accreditors have sanctions institutions, they have typically pointed to financial issues, even though the ed department already undertakes extensive financial reviews.

At the same time there are numerous cases of accreditors imposing extraneous social and political goals. Recently accreditors have even extended their reach into governance. A realm which is properly controlled by statute, charters and by-laws, by sanctioning Auburn University for micromanagement by its board.

Now, while I would not say that that board may very well have been working outside its rightful

bounds, I think the question, when it relates to federal accreditation is, why should federally approved accreditors, who almost without exception are university administrators and faculty members whose own interests may conflict with engaged trustees, have life and death power over universities that gives them the ability to second-guess boards who are legally responsible.

Call for the development of institutional expectations and assessments for student learning. The Commission is already well aware of surveys documenting a serious lack of literacy in our country and reports from the business community that they must retrain. This is where the Commission's extensive focus on assessment is important. Individual institutional governing boards working with faculty, students and other stakeholders, must focus on what institutions are teaching and whether students are learning. The challenge obviously is to get the right information to the right people and to do so in a way that does not require too many indicators and too burdensome information.

On the governance front, call on governors and boards to insist on informed trustees. As the highest elected officials in their states, governors

are the key to the cultural transformation in the public system. In most states they appoint trustees and state education officials. They can and must be made aware of higher education challenges and give trustees a mandate to address those issues.

Call for trustee training. There are training programs for new college presidents and a similar and sustained program should be developed for trustees. In the wake of Sarbanes Oxley and the growing demand to apply strict standards to non-profit trustees, this kind of training is timely and important.

Academic culture is very different from the experience of most trustees. If they are to be successful in performing their fiduciary responsibilities, they need training in how to be effective leaders in the unique context of an academic institution. And it's imperative that they remain up to date on central issues, with advice and information not only from insiders but from outside experts as well who can bring both a national perspective and best practices to bear.

Emphasize the need for boards to hire presidents who will be agents of change. An era of accountability requires a new style of presidential

leadership. Board chairmen should be primed to insist that boards cast a wide net and find innovative leaders who are not afraid to question the status quo.

Call for board transparency. In the wake of recent problems at the University of California and American University, public boards should consider annually reporting the compensation of highly paid employees and senior administrators. And once the presidential selection process is completed, boards must make it clear that they will annually evaluate and document the president's performance.

Urge the media to pay attention to workings of public and private boards. In the public sector media focus will ensure that governors take their appointment seriously. In the private sector, as in the case of American University, public attention can help expose questionable practices and stimulate corrective action.

Higher education is a $250 billion enterprise and for that reason alone warrants close scrutiny.

For too long constituencies such as alumni, trustees and, yes, Commissioners, have been expected to remain outside the walls of the ivory tower, particularly when it comes to issues of

academic quality and accountability. There are those inside the Academy who believe they should have autonomy, absolute autonomy. To them the role of trustees, alumni and governor and commissions is to provide support, period.

The logic behind the tradition is deceptively simple. Academic decisions should be made on academic grounds. Hence, they should be made by academics. But as I've attempted to outline and as I think we've heard in the course of these proceedings, current conditions in the Academy call for outside scrutiny.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni was launched a decade ago to focus on those conditions and to mobilize thoughtful alumni and trustees on behalf of rigorous general education, good teaching, high standards, low tuition and academic freedom. And alumni and trustees know and understand that to remain competitive our institutions of higher learning must remain focused on academic standards, academic excellence and transparency.

Most institutions and their internal constituencies need checks and balances and higher education is no exception. That is why the work of this Commission is so important and why the American

Council of Trustees and Alumni are indeed grateful to have the opportunity to articulate the concerns of trustees and alumni. Thank you.

DR. EWELL: Thank you, Anne, for that statement. And turn to Kevin Carey of Education Sector.

MR. CAREY: On behalf of Education Sector, which as you may not know is a new non-partisan education policy think-tank located in Washington, D.C. that works on a range of issues. Everything from pre-kindergarten through higher education.

I'd like to thank the Chairman and the members of the Commission for the opportunity to come and speak today. Particularly because it gives me a chance to come back to my former home in Indianapolis and to catch up with some of my colleagues with whom I used to work on higher education issues in the Indiana State House, just a few steps up Market Street. Which you should all visit while you're here, it's really a beautiful building.

In the past months this Commission has heard testimony documenting a number of major challenges facing American higher education today. Other industrialized nations are catching up to and even surpassing our once commanding lead in producing

college graduates. Spiraling costs are limiting opportunities for lower income students. Less than two-thirds of all students graduate within six years of starting in four-year colleges. And a study released earlier this year that Peter Ewell alluded to, found that less than half of all college seniors are proficient in measures of literacy.

And I would point out that all of those numbers are must worse for traditionally disadvantaged and minority students. Let me just give you one example. This fall, out of every hundred African-American freshman who enroll at a four-year institution, seven will enroll at an institution with an African-American six-year graduation rate of 70 percent or more. Twenty-eight, four times as many, will enroll at an institution with an African-American six-year graduation rate of 30 percent or less. Thirty percent or less. I know there are some questions about if you take transfers into account whether those numbers go up, but they don't go up that much from 30 percent to a number that anyone would be comfortable with.

And again, if you look at those literacy numbers of college seniors, you'd find that the literacy rates for African-American seniors are less

than half of those for white seniors. To the point that it's pretty clear that the achievement gaps in K-12 education, for which we're all so familiar, not only persists into higher education but actually, in some subjects, grow larger by the time students finish.

So clearly we have to do much better. And I commend the Commission for the seriousness with which it has addressed these issues. And so I'll make three points. All of which are around the subject of information and transparency.

First, it's very clear that the higher education world operates basically in a void of information about quality. Students and parents making decisions about where to go to college have little or no information about which colleges will actually serve them best. All they really have to do -- all they really have to rely on is information from places like U.S. News and World Report which are based almost exclusively on three measures, wealth, fame and exclusivity. That's what those rankings are based on. And they don't really have anything to do with the quality of teaching and learning.

And moreover, really I think in most institutions even sort of that flawed U.S. News

paradigm doesn't really work very well. I mean if you look at the numbers, the large majority of students attend local public two-year and four-year institutions that are very similar to each other in the sense that none of them have very much money, they're all basically anonymous outside of their local regions and they all admit most of the students who apply. So even that measure didn't even really work very well for all of those.

And this vacuum of information about quality really has terribly distorting effects on the market incentives that shape institutional behavior. Wealth, fame and exclusivity are vital to reputations, and therefore that's what people focus on. Teaching students well and helping them earn degrees, by contrast, are essentially very important but they are optional goals for institutions.

Which is really why it's so exciting to hear about the efforts of my fellow panelists this morning, people who are conducting really truly groundbreaking work to create solid, empirical data focused on what actually happens in college and how well students are actually learning. And really I would say that supporting their work as well as if other new investments in high quality information

about a similar nature to be a major priority for this Commission. Although as an Ohio State graduate I take exception to what he said about the University of Michigan. But I'm willing to put those differences aside, George. That's how important I think these issues are.

It's also why the Commission should strongly support opportunities to leverage the potential of information technology to understand more about our colleges and universities. And as we've talked about, one proposal was recently put forth by the National Center for Education Statistics to create a unit record system of collecting higher education data.

But we all kind of have observed what happened with that process. While some organizations like, for example, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, to their credit, supported the unit record system. Others, primarily the Association of Independent Colleges, did not. And unfortunately, this common-sense effort has been temporarily derailed in the name of protecting student privacy. I have to be frank. I think the student privacy argument is disingenuous. The real issue here is not student privacy, it is institutional privacy.

NCES was clearly prepared to implement all necessary privacy protections and has a sterling record in this area. The real issue I think quite frankly is that there is a concern felt by some that a unit record system would create new opportunities to shine a light on how well some colleges and universities actually serve their students.

And one other thing I would emphasize is that it's important to note that it really doesn't cost that much money to get all this new information. I mean if you look at how much CLA cost, how much NSSE cost, even how much it costs to implement the Florida system, the Cadillac system, I mean new information is not free but in the grand scheme of things, particularly given the scope of higher education, it is not very expensive.

The second major point I would make this morning is that all of this important new information, if we can create it, will really only be of value to consumers if it's consistently available for every institution. But it is unrealistic to expect that every college and university will provide all of the needed information about themselves voluntarily. They understand that information is the currency of the realm. They are rational, they are self-interested

institutions and they feel -- we cannot expect them to voluntarily release data that puts them in a less than flattering light in the market place. Which is understandable, but it's also not in the best interests of students and consumers. I mean I could kind of draw a parallel. I'm sure that every -- at the end of every financial quarter there are many publicly traded companies that would rather not file detailed financial information with the Securities and Exchange Commission. But we all understand the importance of that kind of transparency to consumers.

Historically, requirements for mandatory reporting have always met with some resistance. The existing federal Student-Right-To-Know provisions are a good example of that. But I think it's instructive to note that no one is seriously suggesting now that those requirements be rolled back. After a period of adjustment, people get used to reporting of information and they move forward. Disclosure of vital information about higher education quality should be mandatory and not optional. Again, if you'll return to the parallel in the markets. Publicly traded companies enjoy public benefits. And in exchange for that transparency they have access to capital through the stock market. Just as all

institutions of higher education in the public and non profit realm, enjoy substantial public benefits in terms of the financial benefits that we talked about yesterday.

In both cases the essential bargaining ought to be transparency in exchange for public benefits. But that bargaining is not in place to the extent that it ought to be in higher education today.

The third point I would make is that transparency alone is not enough. It's not enough to simply give students and parents access to data. Someone also needs to make sense of that data for them, to boil it down and make it understandable so they can use it to make decisions about where to go to college. That's why U.S. News and World Reports sells so many magazines. That's what they do. In a lot of ways I find a lot of these discussions about whether we should or should not have a national system of higher education accountability to kind of miss the point, we have one already. It just happens to be owned and operated by a for-profit news magazine.

So it's critically important that this Commission move not only to provide more public information to consumers, but also to provide practical, understandable tools for consumers to use

in making choices. And quite frankly, I don't think there's any reason why those couldn't include rankings. I mean we talked about it a little bit today. And I think the people have made very reasonable statements that it would be wrong, for example, to simply rate all the institutions by NSSE or the CLA. But if you think about what we've talked about over the last couple of days, if you could bring information like the NSSE to the table and information like the CLA to the table and information about course completion, like Carol Twigg talked about, and the kind of graduation rate versus peers information that Kati Haycock and the education staff put together, and the kind of labor market information that the state of Florida can do now and put all those things together into a comprehensive measure and rank institutions that way, I think that would be a real shift in the way that we see institutions today.

And finally, I think we need to have our eyes open and acknowledge that in moving ahead on these fronts it's very likely that you will encounter some resistance from the higher education community. Proposals to increase transparency and provide common judgments of quality are often characterized as inappropriate infringements on the autonomy higher

education has long enjoyed.

Let me be clear. I think the diversity and independence of America's higher education sector has long been one of the system's chief virtues. Responsibility and decision making about how best to educate American college students should be left to individual institutions and the educators who work there.

But while the government shouldn't be in the business of telling colleges and universities how to teach their students, it should be in the business of telling consumers, parents, and the public at large how well those students are being educated. It should be in the business of providing real information about quality to higher education market. Autonomy and secrecy are not the same thing.

And I think going forward, we all understand that there will be a period of adjustment, greater transparency will be uncomfortable for people. I think it's a simple fact of life that people tend to avoid the harsh light of public scrutiny and accountability if they can. But it's also abundantly clear, again if we look at the data about how our system is working today, that students need far more information about quality than they're currently

receiving.

So I think this Commission is in a position to catalyze a new era of greatly expanded higher education information. And if it does so, I think the resulting shift in market pressures on institution leaders and individual educators can really give them better reasons to focus their priorities on what matters most, which is helping all students learn and earn a degree. Again, yesterday morning we heard a number of very talented, innovative people present a whole range of ideas about how to reduce costs, to increase affordability, to improve the quality of learning. And there are lots more people like that out there in higher education.

But I think that the higher education system has always been slow to embrace these kind of solutions, not because the ideas themselves are unworthy but because the right incentives aren't in place to make people seek them out. You know, I find that people -- they discuss the challenge of bringing these new ideas to the scale. I think there was a communications problem, I think it's an incentive problem. I guess to put it another way, I think that the lack of innovation in the higher education sector is not a supply side problem, it's a demand side

problem.

And I was thinking a few days ago, just to kind of wrap up, the Washington Post, I live in Washington, D.C., it ran a story announcing the resignation of the President of George Washington University Stephen Trachtenberg, who is by all, I think, kind of contemporary opinion, been a very, very successful president. And what the Post did was they had a few paragraphs that basically summed up his accomplishments in the 20 years he's been the president there.

Here's what they said he did. He grew the endowment, the endowment is far larger than it was when he got there; the applicant pool has increased from 3,000 to about 20,000 students and so the selectivity of the institution has become much greater; the academic reputation of the institution as measured by the credentials of faculty is much greater; the physical plant of George Washington University has expanded greatly, somewhat to the discomfort of the people who live nearby I think in Washington; and the basketball team is in the NCAA tournament this year and is doing a lot better.

And when I read that, you know, it struck me that that I think is a pretty concise and

comprehensive list of the terms of success in higher education today. And so we think about the university leaders who will or will not decide to do all of these things. Good leaders focus on what's most important. They figure out the rules of the game and they play it. And so I think that the challenge that you have as Commissioners is to take all of those ideas that were on the wall yesterday, move them off the wall and move them onto that short list of priorities for institutional leaders. To move them on to the terms of success, on which quite frankly they do not exist today.

And the fact of the matter is we have information about some of those things. We know about graduation rates, for example, but, you know, they're not paid attention to as much as they ought to be. And so that's kind of one of the things that we do.

But a lot of the things -- and actually another example, we know about how well institutions serve low income students. And I think it's been actually enormously helpful to observe how some of the elite institutions, because there was a lot of publicity about the very low number of low income students, have kind of on their own, there's this dynamic in competition that starts to be generated,

where they're voluntarily changing their policies because of that kind of public information and exposure.

So I think that this Commission right now -- but the thing about teaching and learning is that there is no information. We don't have that data, it doesn't exist right now to kind of bring into the market. So if this Commission supports the new information about quality that we heard about this morning, if it works to bring that information to consumers in a way that they can use, I think it can really change the way the people see our colleges and universities, change the market incentives that really will ultimately govern institutional decisions and increase that demand for innovation. And students, parents, and really our whole society will be better off for it.

So, again, thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today.

DR. EWELL: Thank you, Kevin. We have about eight minutes for dialogue. Okay, let's give the Commission a chance.

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Yeah, Peter, I must confer, listen to -- these were great presentations I think. I may be a minority of one who feels that.

Looking at some of my fellow Commissioners during Anne's presentation reminded me of someone having a hemorrhoid operation, looking like --

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: Without an anesthetic. All right, he's asking -- never mind.

This Commission has focused on a lot of things. One thing it has said relatively little about is the quality of the outcomes of our students. Relatively little.

Now, we get into that some with the CLA test and the engagement test. But what should we be teaching students, what should they be learning, what are they learning? We have paid little attention to this.

The word grade inflation was mentioned for the first time, not the first time but I think the second time today, in all of our meetings. Do we care about this? Is it important? I think it is. The decline in adult literacy amongst college students -- another survey I've seen shows no value added among students at many colleges on basic knowledge of civil institutions in this country.

Are we not going to say something about these issues in our report? I don't know that I can

sign onto any report that doesn't say something about these. And certainly something about cost efficiency issues which were not on our top three list that we listed yesterday. And maybe no one cares where I stand, but I do. And I'll be damn sure to have a piece in the Wall Street Journal on it, too, I can tell you that.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: So I think maybe in the interest of collegiality and whatnot, we need to pay some focus to these. And also what Kevin said, which was very good. Kevin actually picked up on themes that have been made earlier, a little more mainstream in that it -- I guess one of the news people said we are now a mainstream commission. And Kevin's remarks, a little more mainstream but very instructive.

DR. EWELL: Other comments or questions? Art?

COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: Yes. I'd just ask Anne Neal a question. With all your ten years experience in what you're doing, to what extent do you think you had any impact on trustees? I mean actual impact on trustees changing the dynamics at an institution?

MS. NEAL: Well, we're working incrementally. I think there's some very good examples of effective trustees. As I said, University of Texas is certainly one good example of a board that really has taken on big issues. I think the State University of New York system has been an exemplary board. They've looked at general education, they've looked at assessments, they've looked at teacher education. George Mason board has looked at general education. Colorado now is engaged in a statewide assessment of its core curriculum. It's doing very good public release of information relating to grade. It's also looking at one of the issues that we heard about earlier today which is the problem for boys. One of the things that's been dictated by the State Council for Higher Ed in Colorado is that people coming out of teacher ed schools know how to read data and know how to understand that there may be different learning experiences for boys and girls.

So there's a wonderful example of statewide board, by board, by board, I think taking on many of these important issues.

COMMISSIONER ROTHKOPF: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: A followup. Anne, is the progress mostly with state universities? How

do you do with the private institutions?

MS. NEAL: I will say the privates are a good deal less penetrable because trustees, for the most part, are appointees. They come into their job with much more a sense of the work that they are doing is in the public interest. I think we are beginning to see, and certainly this was on the table of the discussions of American University, which is chartered by Congress but is essentially a private, I think there's more and more focus now on non profit size. Whether or not, for instance, a 32, 42, sometimes 60 person board. Whether or not those are really governing boards or whether or not they're actually fund raising boards.

So I'm hoping if we look as the private sector begins to see more of these issues in the press, that the private universities will take the opportunity to look at their governing structures and to see if there are ways that they can make themselves more effective governors rather than just fund raisers.

COMMISSIONER DONOFRIO: Thank you.

DR. EWELL: Yes, David?

COMMISSIONER WARD: Anne, I'd like to continue a dialogue you and I once had because there

are two overlapping issues in the Commission and I'd like your reflections on it.

One of them is this idea of advanced placement and shortening the cycle time of the degree perhaps to three, three and a half years, because the ways of having some general education met in high school, that's the theory we heard Governor Caperton talk about, advanced placement, as a very systemic approach to this. Or whether advanced placement ought not to be seen as a substitute for college but just a way of elevating the quality of high school courses and there's no gaining credits when you get to college.

But as you look at general education, do you feel that its entirety needs to be carried by the college or are there some students who in high school can in fact already have taken that?

And the second thing would be that particularly as we deal with the pressure for pre-major requirements in say genetics, bio-chemistry, computer science, sometimes these students want, in a sense, to get there early. It's not because of the potpourri of courses, they're just driven to get to their major very early. I was one of those kids in England actually. I wanted to get to my major and

perhaps neglected a little bit. The motive was not, you know -- it was effective motives in other words, rather than -- I missed out on some general education which I got later, but the drive was academic specialization which has got some virtue, too.

So I just worry a little bit about as you look at the core curriculum which I actually agree with, that there is a sort of inventory -- connected inventory of knowledge that is the core of what is needed, but where and how it's delivered it seems to me may need some flexibility as you move to higher education or as you have students which were very precocious and are seeking to specialize early. I heard you talk about this a little bit already.

MS. NEAL: I remember David and I did have this dialogue over dinner and I'm not sure either one of us got any food that night.

In terms of general education, I think it's interesting. If you look at the college catalogs, virtually every institution it espouses general education, the need to have that common core. So my sense is, for better for worse, that most institutions feel a general education is important and that it is a goal worth achieving.

I think also if you look at the existing

accreditation system one of the criteria that the accreditors go in is to ascertain that there is a general education program at the institutions that they are accrediting. So it seems to me that there is a fairly good consensus that general education is important at the college level and that it provides an opportunity for, if you will, a common conversation, whether it's for the advanced student or for the less advanced student. I think we heard earlier that we're seeing some very interesting trends. On the one hand you've got more kids taking APs, but on the other hand you've got more remediation. And I think that the general education curriculum is a way to incorporate students at all levels into that conversation in a way that also helps you go back into K-12 and have more of an alignment.

Certainly there are some students that are going to come in with more training than others. But does that obviate the need for the university to have a curriculum that focuses on general areas of knowledge? It gives students at the college level the opportunity to have that dialogue. I would suggest it doesn't.

DR. EWELL: Bob Zemsky is probably going to have to be one of the last comments.

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Two quick observations. One, I serve as a trustee. I've been a trustee a long time. Your description doesn't fit me and the members of the board I serve with. That's just an observation.

The second observation --

MS. NEAL: What's your board, we'll use it as a case in point.

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: I'm a long term trustee of Franklin Marshall College.

The second observation is this core curricular discussion has been with us for a quarter century now. I know it's a quarter century because that's how long ago Fred Rudolph really did integrate into the college classroom and that's how long ago my group did the statistical analysis that prove all the things he said were right. But that's a quarter century. This isn't something new. And you have to begin to ask, what is the dynamic because it's not a new dynamic. It's been here a long time and it's probably beyond the point where rhetoric is going to change it. We probably have reached a point where if the consumers don't want it, we aren't going to give it to them. And that's a cruel thing to say and I understand that, but that's really what the dynamic

looks like.

And the idea that we could in some way mandate a return to the core curriculum is just a world that no longer exists.

MS. NEAL: Well, let me address that. I think higher education typically comes out with surveys and it looks at what students themselves are seeking when they go to colleges. And freshmen, and if you will if we may call them the consumers, have typically said that they are interested in a strong general education. So I do believe actually that the consumers are seeking that. And I think that, again, and this gets back to accountability, it's incumbent on our institutions not to respond simply to the consumer but to determine what every graduate should know.

And to get back to the Governor's question and concern earlier, the national interest in having civic literacy and having students who understand economics and are exposed to broad areas of knowledge, I think that's critical if going forward our higher education system is to remain supreme.

And so I think rather than viewing it as to what students what, I think it should be what do students need and how do we get there and how do we

engage them in a way that will help them be informed citizens, expert workers and lifelong learners.

DR. EWELL: Gerri Elliott.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Yeah, I wanted to talk to Anne and Kevin, I thought your presentations were outstanding. We have talked about transparency on this Commission and said that we need to provide a way for this type of information to get out there. And I truly believe that once you shine the light of day on it, market forces take over and things change. I can't believe I'm actually agreeing with Richard. It's amazing right now.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: With that, my question though is to both of you. Where is this information? Where is the survey you mentioned, Anne, some of the information you were sharing; where is it? Is it -- is it on a web site somewhere? Is it published? How do you get your hands on it?

MS. NEAL: I'll get you one. These books are available certainly on our web site or it can be ordered through our web site, www.goactive.org. And obviously it is our hope to be doing more and more state by state surveys. So that not only do we have the Big 10, Big 12, Ivy League, but we can actually go

into the states and analyze the curricula for governors, for citizens, for parents, so that they actually see what is required.

And one of the things that is difficult, as we've looked at it and we've been in higher ed forever, trying to read the curriculum and actually figure out what's required and what's not required, is something like reading a medieval manuscript. It's very difficult.

So parents do need assistance and help in actually seeing what the school is requiring of its students and not just simply taking of the statement, as most catalogs will say, we believe in a strong gen ed and then in fact there will be a hundred, two hundred courses that might satisfy that general education.

COMMISSIONER VEST: I'd like to point out that Anne just, in those comments, put squarely on the table one thing that there has been almost no discussion about here, but absolutely undergirds everything we have talked about. And that is how we strike the balance between a consumerist and utilitarian point of view on the one hand and a responsibility within the Academy, including the governing boards, for the content of what we think

citizens need to know.

This is a tough issue. And I want to thank you for putting it out there. And I think as we all prepare for our next meeting, we've got to give a little thought to this because the simplistic view of transparency and accountability and metrics and so forth, plays very strongly to this side and not very strongly to this side. And it's a complex issue. And I just want to thank you for stating it with that much clarity and to take my last couple of minutes to put a little emphasis on it.

COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Chuck, that was a great closure to the session. Charles had to sneak off, he ask that I facilitate bringing this to closure.

Panel, this has been certainly an interesting and an important element and I think a lively discussion that we wish the Commission to consider, this whole notion of accountability. I really want to thank you for your time and energy in facilitating and educating us in this discussion and it will certainly play an important part as we go forward with our recommendations.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Thank you. We

probably have just one last item as a Commission prior to our departure. As was discussed earlier, we certainly had a lively discussion yesterday. I have copies of the results I'd like to hand out for all of us from the Commission standpoint.

What you'll find on this sheet are three items. One is a definition of higher education. Another is the shared values we discussed yesterday and thanks to the dialogue and Bob Mendenhall's help, shortened those words up. As well as incorporated a number of other items that everyone came back with.

And then on the second page are the results of our key strategy vote that we went through yesterday.

I think from my perspective, thinking about this again last night and looking at this this morning prior to running this off, my sense is I think we have a pretty good view of where we are in the shared values. I would go back to Richard's comment, it's not entirely clear we have alignment yet around what the critical actions are. And I think that as we look forward to our meeting in May, certainly we ought to think about what are the key elements necessary for us to be successful implementing that set of shared values.

And so I wanted to just leave that with you from a thought standpoint. Cheryl, do you want to kind of give us a rundown on plans for our next meeting, please?

MS. OLDHAM: Next meeting you all I'm sure know, May 18th and 19th in D.C. Charles mentioned yesterday there's been some discussion and some thought about an additional meeting sometime in May and he's alluded to sort of doing an informal poll of everybody, June or July, to see if there's a date that would work for everyone. So we'll get to you on that.

We don't plan to have, at this point, presenters for the May meeting, as he also mentioned. So it's going to be a discussion for, you know, that length of time. Yeah, Bob?

COMMISSIONER ZEMSKY: Can I make two pleas? One is as the staff comes to the May meeting, that you resist any temptation whatsoever to bring us a draft? That we need to see bullet points and potential recommendations and the like. I think if you try to close this discussion you're going to run into trouble. I thought the kind of thing we did yesterday really worked well and I'm hopeful that more of that will be done in May.

And having said that, my second point is

to strongly urge a face-to-face meeting as a final. We need one more and we've all given a fair amount of our time to this and I think not to do the last step would really be difficult for us.

COMMISSIONER VEST: I'd like to second that.

COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Okay, good.

Okay, other comments? With no other comments, then --

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: I have just one. I want to thank Rick for his leadership at the end of the afternoon.

COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VEDDER: In absentia we should thank Charles, even though he's not here, for he has really put in an enormous amount of time and effort on this. And I've had many arguments and fights with Charles, as many others here, but no one doubts for a moment his great dedication. And I think it should be acknowledged.

COMMISSIONER STEPHENS: With that, I believe we're adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12:12 o'clock p.m., the meeting was concluded.)

- - - - - - -